

Polem
2414

Russell

THE
JUDGMENT
OF
THE ANGLICAN CHURCH

(POSTERIOR TO THE REFORMATION)

ON THE
SUFFICIENCY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE,

AND THE
AUTHORITY OF THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH IN
MATTERS OF FAITH;

As contained in her authorized Formularies,

AND
ILLUSTRATED BY THE WRITINGS OF HER ELDER MASTERS AND DOCTORS.

WITH AN
INTRODUCTION, NOTES, AND APPENDIX,

BY
JOHN FULLER RUSSELL, S.C.L.

OF ST. PETER'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

*"Magnopere curandum est, ut id teneamus quod ubique, quod
semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est. Hoc est etenim vere pro-
prieque catholicum."*—S. VINCENT. LIRIN.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR A. H. BAILY & CO. 83, CORNHILL;

T. STEVENSON, CAMBRIDGE; AND J. H. PARKER, OXFORD.

1838.

Bayerische
Staatsbibliothek
München

THE LANCET

OF THE LANCET

OF THE LANCET

OF THE LANCET

OF THE LANCET

OF THE LANCET

OF THE LANCET

OF THE LANCET

LONDON:
R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD-STREET-HILL.

OF THE LANCET

TO
THE REVEREND
HUGH JAMES ROSE, B. D.

PRINCIPAL OF KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON,

&c. &c. &c.

WHOSE NAME
WILL EVER BE HELD IN DEEP LOVE AND REVERENCE BY TRUE
CHURCHMEN,

This Volume

IS

(BY PERMISSION)

RESPECTFULLY AND GRATEFULLY INSCRIBED.

ANNALS

OF THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

*A. H. Baily & Co. beg to inform the Subscribers to Mr. RUSSELL'S
" Judgment of the Anglican Church," that as it is thought ad-
visable not to delay the publication of the Work, a complete List,
including all those Names which are left with the Booksellers in
Cambridge and Oxford, will be printed in the Second Edition.*

STUDY GUIDE

1. The first part of the book is devoted to a study of the history of the United States from the time of the discovery of the continent to the present. The second part is devoted to a study of the political system of the United States. The third part is devoted to a study of the social system of the United States. The fourth part is devoted to a study of the economic system of the United States. The fifth part is devoted to a study of the cultural system of the United States. The sixth part is devoted to a study of the religious system of the United States. The seventh part is devoted to a study of the legal system of the United States. The eighth part is devoted to a study of the military system of the United States. The ninth part is devoted to a study of the foreign relations of the United States. The tenth part is devoted to a study of the future of the United States.

2. The first part of the book is devoted to a study of the history of the United States from the time of the discovery of the continent to the present. The second part is devoted to a study of the political system of the United States. The third part is devoted to a study of the social system of the United States. The fourth part is devoted to a study of the economic system of the United States. The fifth part is devoted to a study of the cultural system of the United States. The sixth part is devoted to a study of the religious system of the United States. The seventh part is devoted to a study of the legal system of the United States. The eighth part is devoted to a study of the military system of the United States. The ninth part is devoted to a study of the foreign relations of the United States. The tenth part is devoted to a study of the future of the United States.

SUBSCRIBERS.

A.

Berkeley Addison, Esq. St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

The Rev. James S. M. Anderson, M. A. Chaplain in Ordinary
to the Queen, Chaplain to the Queen Dowager, and Per-
petual Curate of St. George's Chapel, Brighton.

— Andrews, Esq. 14, City Chambers.

Jarvis Holland Ash, Esq. Cotham House, Bristol, 2 *Copies*.

B.

The Rev. Harris Barling, M. A. Brooke Lodge, Norfolk.

The Rev. Charles Webb Le Bas, M. A. PRINCIPAL OF THE
EAST INDIA COLLEGE, Herts, and Prebendary of Lincoln.

The Rev. J. W. Bellamy, B. D. Head Master of Merchant
Tailors' Grammar School, London.

George Thomas Berkeley, Esq. Queen's College, Oxford.

The Rev. W. Arundell Bouverie, B. D. Rector of West Tyther-
ley, Hants, and Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Salisbury.

The Rev. Langton E. Brown, B. A. West Dean, Wilts.

Arthur B. Bryer, Esq. B. A. Exeter College, Oxford, and 6,
Canterbury Row, Newington, Surrey.

Mr. Ynyr Burges, 13, Blandford Square, Regent's Park.

Thomas Burton, Esq. St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

SUBSCRIBERS.

C.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF CHICHESTER.

The Rev. William Carus, M. A. Fellow of Trinity College,
Cambridge.

The Rev. William Castell, M. A. Vicar of Brooke, Norfolk.

The Rev. James Challis, M. A. PLUMIAN PROFESSOR OF
ASTRONOMY, Cambridge.

The Rev. Robert Chamberlain, B. A. St. Peter's College, Cam-
bridge, 2 *Copies*.

The Rev. Gilbert Chesnutt, B. A. Minister of the Church of
the Holy Trinity, Newington, Surrey.

George William Cockerell, Esq. Queen's College, Oxford.

The Rev. Derwent Coleridge, M. A. Head Master of Helston
Grammar School, Cornwall.

The Rev. William B. Collyer, D. D. LL.D. F. A. S. Peckham.

The Rev. Henry Wilkinson Cookson, M. A. Fellow of St. Peter's
College, Cambridge.

The Rev. Robert Cooper, B. A. of St. Peter's College, Cam-
bridge, and Rector of Howe, Norfolk.

The Rev. George E. Corrie, B. D. Tutor of Catharine Hall,
Cambridge.

D.

The Rev. John Day, M. A. Yelverton, Norfolk.

The Rev. William Dealtry, D. D. F. R. S. Chancellor and Pre-
bendary of Winchester.

The Rev. William Dodsworth, M. A. Perpetual Curate of Christ
Church, St. Pancras.

SUBSCRIBERS.

The Rev. S. Britton Dowell, M. A. Fellow of St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

The Rev. George D'Oyly, D. D. F. R. S. Rector of Lambeth.

John Busher Duncan, Esq. B. A. St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

F.

John Fuller, Esq. Dunmow, Essex, *2 Copies.*

G.

The Rev. William S. Gilly, D. D. Prebendary of Durham, and Vicar of Norham.

The Ven. George Glover, M. A. ARCHDEACON OF SUDBURY.

Henry Goldsmith, Esq. St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

The Rev. H. P. Guillemard, M. A. Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.

H.

The Hon. and Rev. LORD ARTHUR C. HERVEY, M. A. Rector of Ickworth, Suffolk.

Edward Harman, Esq. Clay Hill, Enfield.

Edward M. Harrison, Esq. 19, Old Square, Lincoln's Inn.

The Rev. Horatio S. Hildyard, M. A. Fellow of St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

The Rev. William Hodgson, B. D. Tutor of St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

The Rev. Hammet Holditch, M. A. PRESIDENT OF CAIUS COLLEGE, Cambridge.

— Holman, Esq.

The Rev. Walter Farquhar Hook, D. D. Vicar of Leeds, and Prebendary of Lincoln.

SUBSCRIBERS.

The Rev. Thomas Hartwell Horne, B. D. Prebendary of St. Paul's.

The Rev. William Hull, Perpetual Curate of St. Gregory's, Norwich.

I.

SIR ROBERT HARRY INGLIS, Bart. D. C. L. M. P.

The Very Rev. John Ireland, D. D. DEAN OF WESTMINSTER.

The Rev. William J. Irons, M. A. of Queen's College, Oxford, and Minister of St. Peter's Church, Walworth, Surrey.

The Rev. John F. Isaacson, B. D. Tutor of St. John's College, Cambridge.

J.

The Rev. James A. Jeremie, M. A. Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, Classical Professor in the East India College, Herts, and Prebendary of Lincoln.

K.

The Rev. John Keble, M. A. Vicar of Hursley, late Fellow of Oriel, and PROFESSOR OF POETRY, Oxford.

L.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

The Rev. C. John Laprimaudaye, M. A. St. John's College, Oxford.

John Lindsell, Esq. St. Peter's College, Cambridge, and Lincoln's Inn, London.

Langford Lovell, Esq. Hursley, Winchester.

SUBSCRIBERS.

M.

The Right Hon. EARL MANVERS, 13, Portman Square, London,
and Thoresby Park, near Ollerton, Notts.

Pelham Maitland, Esq. St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

The Rev. Lewis Marcus, M.A. Biggleswade, Bedfordshire.

The Rev. Henry Melvill, B.D. late Tutor of St. Peter's Col-
lege, Cambridge.

Philip Melvill, Esq. St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

The Rev. Joseph E. Middleton, Trinity College, Cambridge.

David Rutton Morris, Esq. Walworth, Surrey.

The Rev. Samuel Tenison Mosse, B.A. Trinity College, Dublin.

The Rev. J. H. B. Mountain, M.A. Prebendary of Lincoln, and
Domestic Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Gloucester
and Bristol.

John Murray, Esq. B.A. Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge,
and Middle Temple, London.

N.

His Grace the DUKE OF NEWCASTLE, K.G. D.C.L. 17, Portman
Square, London, and Clumber Park, near Ollerton, Notts.

The Rev. John Henry Newman, B.D. Vicar of St. Mary the
Virgin's, Oxford, and Fellow of Oriel College.

O.

The Rev. Frederic Oakley, M.A. Tutor of Balliol College,
Oxford.

P.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH.

The Rev. William Palmer, M.A. Worcester College, Oxford.

SUBSCRIBERS.

The Rev. John Peel, M. A. Prebendary of Canterbury.

Hon. and Rev. Arthur P. Perceval, B.C.L. Rector of East
Horsley, Surrey.

The Rev. Henry Philpott, M. A. Tutor of Catharine Hall,
Cambridge.

The Rev. John Pitts, B. A. of St. Peter's College, Cambridge,
and Assistant Curate of Street, Somersetshire.

The Rev. William Potter, M. A. late Fellow of St. Peter's Col-
lege, Cambridge, and Rector of Witlesham, Suffolk.

The Rev. Edward Bouverie Pusey, D. D. late Fellow of Oriel,
Canon of Christ Church, and REGIUS PROFESSOR OF
HEBREW, Oxford.

R.

The Rev. George Ray, M. A. Fellow of St. Peter's College,
Cambridge.

The Rev. Hugh James Rose, B. D. PRINCIPAL OF KING'S
COLLEGE, London.

The Rev. Henry John Rose, B. D. Fellow of St. John's College,
Cambridge, and Rector of Houghton Conquest, Bed-
fordshire.

The Rev. Martin Joseph Routh, D. D. PRESIDENT OF MAG-
DALEN COLLEGE, Oxford.

The Rev. Thomas Russell, M. A. Walworth, Surrey.

The Rev. Arthur Tozer Russell, B. C. L. of St. John's College,
Cambridge, and Vicar of Caxton, Cambridgeshire.

S.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Frederic Henry Scrivener, Esq. B. A. Trinity College, Cam-
bridge.

SUBSCRIBERS.

- William H. Schwabe, Esq. B. A. Caius College, Cambridge.
William J. Shearly, Esq. St. Peter's College, Cambridge.
George Simpson, Esq. M. A. 19, Old Square, Lincoln's Inn.
The Rev. Charles Smith, B. D. late Tutor of St. Peter's College,
Cambridge, and Rector of Newton, Suffolk.
Robert Southey, Esq. LL. D. POET LAUREAT, Keswick, Cum-
berland.
The Rev. John Hume Spry, D. D. F. R. S. Rector of St. Mary-
la-bonne, and Prebendary of Canterbury.
The Rev. F. J. Stainforth, M. A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

T.

- Alexander Tate, M. A. Emmanuel College, Cambridge.
The Rev. R. Thomson, M. A. Ellet, Lancaster.
The Rev. G. H. Thomson, M. A. Tottenham.
Edward N. Thornton, Esq. Clapham Common, Surrey.
The Ven. Thomas Thorp, M. A. Tutor of Trinity College,
Cambridge, and ARCHDEACON OF BRISTOL.
The Rev. George Townsend, M. A. Prebendary of Durham,
and Vicar of Northallerton.
The Very Rev. Thomas Turton, D. D. DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH,
and REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, Cambridge.

V.

- Henry John Vernon, Esq. Christ Church, Hants.

W.

- Alexander Watson, Esq. B. A. Corpus Christi College, Cam-
bridge.
George Frederic White, Esq.

SUBSCRIBERS.

Abraham Wilkinson, Esq. M. D. White Webbs, Enfield.

Edward Wilkinson, Esq. ditto, ditto.

Henry Wilkinson, Esq. Clapham Common, Surrey.

Henry James Willis, Esq. Catharine Hall, Cambridge.

Charles William Wood, Esq. St. Peter's College, Cambridge,
and Lincoln's Inn, London.

William Nash Woodham, Esq. Shepreth Hall, Cambridgeshire.

The Rev. Christopher Wordsworth, D. D. MASTER OF TRINITY
COLLEGE, Cambridge.

Henry P. Wright, Esq. St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

P R E F A C E.

THE object of this volume is to set at rest (so far as the decision of the Church of England is concerned) the disputed questions of the sufficiency of Scripture, and the value of Tradition. For this purpose, citations respecting these important subjects have been made from the Canons, Articles, and other Formularies which the Anglican Church has, from time to time, authoritatively published. These quotations are copiously illustrated by others from the writings of the distinguished men who were concerned in the composition and promulgation of the above Formularies,

PREFACE.

from the works of their friends and contemporaries, and of other Theologians, their great successors in the Priesthood. The authorities cited extend in an unbroken order from 1556 to 1747; and among them will be found the decisions (not merely of “a few” of our “ancient Divines”—but) of our Reformers, Martyrs, Bishops, and Confessors—our most illustrious Champions against Heresy and Schism—those, in a word, to whom universal consent has assigned the rank and honour of Doctors and Masters of the Anglican Church.

But it may be urged, that the positions contained in this Work are disputed by the *majority* of the Clergy and Laity now alive; that since Religion is a practical and not merely speculative Institution, the doctrines of a Church, at any given time, may best be learned from what its Pastors generally teach and its members generally believe, and therefore the present Volume does *not* exhibit the “judgment” of the Church of England, with reference to Scripture and Tradition.

PREFACE.

This objection may be briefly answered as follows :—

The reader of Ecclesiastical History is aware that at a period not very far removed from Primitive times, the Prelates, Clergy, and People of the Eastern branch of the Universal Church were so ensnared by Heresy that the true Doctrine was confined to but a small minority of Catholics : but will it be thence inferred that the Creed of the heterodox majority was *acknowledged* by the Eastern *Church*—in other words, that she destroyed herself by apostasy ? Surely not : for Christian Antiquity has declared the despised minority the Guardians and correct Expounders of the Doctrinal Deposit, committed to that Church by the Apostles ; and that *they*, and not their opponents, were the organs through which her voice was heard. Now, admitting (what remains to be proved) that the principles here set forth, though confessedly those of the CHURCH in her authorized Declarations—*are* unpopular among her Clergy and Laity, the consequence of

PREFACE.

the admission only amounts to this, namely, That certain persons are inconsistent members of her Communion, and faithless to the tenets which they stand pledged to support; and that others (a small minority, if you will), in the midst of the general defection, still continue to witness to the real principles of their revered and holy Mother.

Further, it may be objected that our Church *allows* two very different, or even contradictory sentiments, respecting Tradition, to be publicly taught by her members, and therefore the holders of *neither* have a right to call them more than opinions *in* the Church. To which we reply, that a Church may authoritatively *decide*, where, from particular and temporary circumstances, she cannot always *enforce*; consequently, to say, *before inquiry*, that *because* essentially opposite sentiments are promulgated within her, *therefore* she cannot have pronounced any judgment on the subject in dispute, is assuredly to argue illogically. When, in the last century,

PREFACE.

Arianism was preached with impunity in our Communion, did Trinitarianism become simply an opinion *in* our Church? No one will venture such an assertion with her Liturgy, Creeds, and Articles before him; and yet to such a conclusion would the above objection inevitably lead.

It must, probably, be confessed, that the method pursued in the following pages is the only one by which any doctrine of a Church can be fairly ascertained. A reference to the list of Authors cited will show, that in making this inquiry, the Editor has been guided by the strictest impartiality. The Work has been compiled¹ with no party purpose. It will condemn no one who is not “condemned already” in the judgment of the Anglican Church.

¹ This Publication had been some time in preparation when the Editor was informed that a *Catena Patrum*, on the rule of St. Vincent, was in the press. When the *Catena* appeared, the following Work was nearly completed; and the Editor was gratified to find, that although several extracts in each were necessarily alike, the general character of the publications was sufficiently dissimilar to render each useful in its own sphere and for its own object.

PREFACE.

The labour of prosecuting this undertaking has been its own reward. No one can humbly commune with our old standard Divines, without becoming enlightened by their sublime wisdom, and edified by their charity and pure devotion.

The Editor has only, in conclusion, to thank those Noblemen and Gentlemen, lay and clerical,² who have kindly lent him the

¹ The Editor may adopt the language of an illustrious Poet :

My days among the dead are past,
Around me I behold,
Where'er these casual eyes are cast,
The mighty minds of old :
My never-failing friends are they,
With whom I converse day by day.

My hopes are with the dead ; anon
My place with them will be,
And I with them shall travel on
Thro' all futurity ;

Yet leaving here a name, I trust,
That will not perish with the dust.—SOUTHEY.

² He would in particular tender his grateful acknowledgments to the Rev. Dr. Pusey, the Rev. Henry J. Rose, and the Rev. W. J. Irons, for their kind and judicious advice ; and to the Rev. H. W. Cookson, Fellow of St. Peter's College, for his courteous attention respecting the Library of that Society.

PREFACE.

sanction of their names, and to express an earnest hope that the following compendium may lead, so far as this is practicable, to a more general perusal of *all* the writings of our elder Masters and Doctors¹—may help to silence the misrepresentations of Roman and other sectaries, and hasten the revival of ancient piety and faith.

ST. PETER'S COLLEGE.

*The Vigil of the Feast of All Saints.*²

¹ The voluminous nature of these writings, unfortunately renders them sealed books to the great majority of the Clergy. Happy, in this respect, is he whose lot is cast in the neighbourhood of our noble University and College Libraries, or the well-stored cases of some of our Nobility and Gentry.

² See the Collect for the day, and the Appendix, No. II. p. 270.

ERRATA.

Page xli, line 17, *for shrines read temples.*

- xlvii, — 14, *for commentary read commonitory.*
- liii, — 9, *for judges read judge.*
- lxii, — 26, *dele the comma between secundum and ordinem.*
- 19, — 30, *for instructions read instruction.*
- 85, — 26, *dele the commas between believe and as he doth, and between doth and the four Gospels.*
- 107, — 17, *for aditâ read traditâ.*
- 248, — 12, Note, *for doctrines read Doctrine.*

INTRODUCTION.

THE following Introduction is designed to exhibit a brief *summary* of the “Judgment of the Anglican Church” with regard to the sufficiency of Scripture and the value of Catholic Tradition. The reader will be left, in a great measure, to test its assertions by a reference to the authorities cited in the body of the Work.

I. A most rapid survey of the contents of this volume must convince any one that the *written* Word is regarded with supreme reverence by the Church of England. She declares in her sixth Article, that “holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not

The sufficiency of holy Scripture.

read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation ;”¹ and accordingly (in opposition to all traditions professing to contain fundamental doctrines which are not in Scripture) holy Writ, as interpreted by the “Catholic Religion,” is called by our old divines, the paramount RULE (*i. e.* Standard and Guide) OF FAITH.

Primitive
Catholic
Tradition.

II. But, while the Church of England honours the Bible as the Record, Depository, and Touchstone of Truth—the “Document of proof,” she regards—as has just been hinted—with religious respect and veneration all *Primitive Catholic Tradition*. By an Act of the Legislature passed in the first year of the reign of Elizabeth, and confirmed by Convocation in 1640, the decision of the first four General Councils is made the Rule by which heresies are to be convicted and condemned;² and all our Masters and Doctors unreservedly admit the existence and value of Tradition.

A few quotations (selected from the following

¹ See p. 2.

² Pp. 3, 4, 5.

pages) may serve to confirm this position, which has sometimes been disputed.

CRANMER allows that "when all the Fathers agreed in the exposition of any place in Scripture, he looked on that as flowing from the SPIRIT of GOD."¹ "That which is of GOD," says HOOKER, "and may be evidently proved to be so, we deny not, that it hath in his kind, although unwritten, yet the self-same force and authority with the written laws of GOD."² BILSON confesses that "there can nothing be Catholic, unless it be confirmed two ways: first by the authority of GOD's Law, and next by the Tradition of the Catholic Church."³ FIELD remarks, "Much contention there hath been about traditions, some urging the necessity of them, and others rejecting them. For the clearing thereof we must observe, that though we reject the uncertain and vain traditions of the Papists, yet we reject not all."⁴ DONNE affirms that "the HOLY GHOST were as well to be believed in the Apostles' mouths as in their pens," and that "an Apostolical tradition, that is truly so, is good evidence."⁵ CHILLINGWORTH observes, "We are

¹ P. 15.² P. 32.³ P. 37.⁴ P. 43.⁵ P. 49.

ready to receive both Scripture and the sense of Scripture, upon the authority of original Tradition.”¹ LAUD says, “We never did, nor ever will refuse any tradition that is Universal and Apostolic for the better exposition of the Scripture.”² PRIDEAUX allows of “historical and exegetical Tradition.”³ HAMMOND remarks, “I make no scruple to grant that Apostolical traditions, such as are truly so, as well as Apostolical writings, are equally the matter of a Christian’s belief; who is equally secured by the fidelity of the conveyance, that, as the one is Apostolical writing, so the other is Apostolical tradition.”⁴ BRAMHALL writes thus to a Romanist:—“Thou art for Tradition, so am I. But my Tradition is not the tradition of one particular Church contradicted by the tradition of another Church, but the universal and perpetual Tradition of the Christian world united;”⁵ and in another place he calls *such* Tradition “the necessary means of finding out the true sense of Scripture.”⁶ USHER, in his “*Answer to a Jesuit*,” distinguishes between Catholic and Roman traditions, and, after admitting the former, proceeds to observe, “Traditions, therefore, of this nature,

¹ P. 247.² Pp. 63, 64.³ P. 73.⁴ P. 78.⁵ P. 101.⁶ P. 101.

come not within the compass of our controversy, the question being betwixt us *de ipsâ doctrinâ traditâ*, not *de tradendi modo* ; touching the substance of the Doctrine delivered, not of the manner of delivering it.”¹ TAYLOR observes that both Anglicans and Romanists have received the faith “from the fountains of Scripture and Universal Tradition, not they from us, or we from them, but both of us from CHRIST and His Apostles.”² BARROW affirms, “It can, indeed, nowise be safe to follow any such leaders, who in their Doctrine or practice deflect from the great beaten roads of holy Scripture, Primitive Tradition, and Catholic practice.”³ TILLOTSON admits that “general Tradition gives us the greatest and truest light for the right understanding of the true sense and meaning of Scripture.”⁴ STILLINGFLEET says, “We reject nothing that can be proved by an universal Tradition from the Apostolical times downwards.”⁵ PATRICK declares, “It is a calumny to affirm that the Church of England rejects all Tradition ; and I hope, none of her true children are so ignorant, as when they hear that word, to imagine they must rise up and oppose it. No, the Scripture itself is a

¹ P. 107.² P. 116.³ P. 132.⁴ P. 139.⁵ P. 145.

tradition ; and we admit all other traditions which are subordinate, and agreeable unto that ; together with all those things that can be proved to be Apostolical by the general testimony of the Church in all ages.”¹ SHERLOCK affirms “that to be a true exposition of Scripture which agrees with the ancient Formularies of faith, delivered down to us by an unquestionable Tradition, from the first ages of the Church ;” and adds, that the “faith of the Church of England is founded both on Scripture and Apostolic Tradition.”² And WAKE asserts, “We receive with the same veneration whatsoever comes from the Apostles, whether by Scripture or Tradition.”³

These citations might be continued to an almost unlimited extent. More than enough have been given to prove that the Church of England acknowledges *Primitive Tradition*.⁴ And here it may be observed, once for all, that *wherever* in her Formularies, or in the writings of her confessed champions, she inveighs against traditions, it is against such as presume to *add* any essential doctrine to the written Word—not against such as

¹ P. 166.

² P. 167.

³ P. 206.

⁴ See “Notes to the Introduction,” Note (A).

are merely its interpreters, and are allowed by Catholic Antiquity.

III. If it be inquired by what *test* she dis-
 minates between true and counterfeit, Catholic and
 Roman Tradition, I answer, by the application of
 the golden rule of St. VINCENTIUS LIRINENSIS,
Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus : Anti-
 quity, Universality, Consent. This rule (to employ
 the language of Bishop Jebb) has been “received,
 extolled, and acted upon,” by all the great Divines
 of our communion. CRANMER observes, “that the
 whole Church cannot make one Article of faith,
 although it may be taken as a necessary witness for
 the receiving and establishing the same, with these
 three conditions, that the thing which we would
 establish thereby, hath been believed in all places,
 ever, and by all men.”¹ JEWEL exclaims of the
 Romanists, “they have not, O good God! they
 have not on their sides what they pretend to have;
 they have neither Antiquity, Universality, nor Con-
 sent, of either all times or all nations; and of this
 they are not ignorant themselves.”² BILSON writes,
 “Now in the Catholic Church herself we must take
 heed we hold that which hath been believed at all

The test of
Catholic
Tradition.

¹ P. 14.

² P. 24.

times, in all places, of all persons, for that is truly and properly Catholic.”¹ “Were Vincentius his rules,” remarks JACKSON, “as artificial as they are orthodoxical and honest, the issue betwixt us and the Romanist would be very easy and triable.”²

CHILLINGWORTH says, “That whatsoever hath been held necessary to salvation, either by the Catholic Church of all ages, or by the consent of Fathers, measured by Vincentius Lirinensis’s Rule. . . . I do verily believe and embrace.”³ HALL inquires, “What is it which maketh a Church? what is it which maketh that Church One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic? Is it not One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic faith? But what is that? Is it not the same which was delivered by CHRIST and the Apostles to the whole world, and was always and everywhere approved through all ages, even unto our own times?”⁴ HAMMOND, when speaking of the qualifications of true Tradition, observes, “And herein I shall hope also that the resolution will be unquestionable, if it be bounded by those three terms, to which Vincentius Lirinensis, in his defence of the Catholic faith against heresies and innovations, hath directed us, *Universitas, Antiquitas, Consensio* :

¹ P. 37.² P. 52.³ P. 62.⁴ P. 74.

Universality, Antiquity, Consent.”¹ BRAMHALL maintains, “Such a tradition is a full proof, which is received *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*; always, everywhere, and by all Christians.”² USHER says, “That which in the time of the ancient Fathers was accounted to be ‘truly and properly Catholic,’ namely, ‘that which was believed everywhere, always, and by all;’ that in the succeeding ages hath ever more been preserved, and is at this day entirely professed in our Church.”³ TAYLOR affirms, “It is Vincentius Lirinensis’s great Rule of Truth: ‘quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus;’ and he that goes against what is said always, everywhere, and by all Christians, hath need of a new revelation or an infallible spirit, for he hath an intolerable pride and foolishness of presumption.”⁴ STILLINGFLEET says, “That he who questions a clear, full, universal Tradition of the whole Church, from CHRIST’s time to this, will, by the same reason, doubt of all matters of faith, which are conveyed by this testimony to us.” And adds in another place, “we [the Anglicans] are as ready as they [the Romanists] to stand to the unanimous consent of Fathers, and to Vincentius Lirinensis his rules of Antiquity, Universality, and Consent.”⁵ BEVERIDGE remarks, “There have been, as it were,

¹ P. 80.² P. 101.³ Pp. 107, 108.⁴ P. 120.⁵ Pp. 141, 142.

certain *common notions* from the beginning implanted in the minds of all Christians from the constant Tradition of the Apostles for on any other supposition it would be incredible, or even impossible, that they should have been received with so unanimous a consent everywhere, always, and by all.”¹

It would be idle to add to these quotations, especially since the rule of Vincentius is so copiously illustrated, explained, and applied in the following pages.² In their controversies with the Romanists our divines bring every doctrine, every tradition, to the test of this Touchstone of Truth, and express their unfeigned readiness to abide by the trial.³ Whatever has been believed and practised, *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*, in the Catholic Church, *that*

¹ P. 177.

² By Jackson, pp. 52—61, and Hammond, pp. 80—84.

³ “Mark, how each Creed stands in that Test reveal’d,
Romish, and Swiss, and Lutheran novelties!
As in the light of Spenser’s magic shield,
Falsehood lets fall her poison’d cup and flies,
Rome’s seven-headed monster sees and dies!
New forms of Schism which changing times supply,
Behold the unwonted light in wild surprise.
In darkness bold, bright-shining arms they spy,
And down their Parent’s mouth the Imps of Error hie!”

Lyra Apostolica.—*The rule of faith.*

our branch of the Fold of CHRIST is resolved to believe and practise.¹

IV. One reason, doubtless, why our Spiritual Mother so unreservedly admits the rule of St. Vincentius is that mentioned by Bishop BEVERIDGE in the above citation, namely, that it is impossible that one system of Doctrine and Discipline should have been thus universally received, unless it had been at first promulged by the Apostolic College; but another and yet more cogent argument is grounded on her belief that “*the whole Church, all over the world, will never agree together in teaching and enforcing what is not true.*” This assertion will probably startle some who have never closely studied the Formularies of our Church, as illustrated by their authorized Interpreter, her standard Divinity—it may be branded as Popery by others, who term by that odious appellation every tenet and principle which distinguishes the Anglican Communion from the “reformed-continental-churches;” but the candid inquirer will acknowledge that I have not mistated the truth. For, first, if we turn to the twentieth Article, we shall find it asserted that the Catholic Church has “*authority* in controversies of

The indefectibility
of the
Catholic
Church.

¹ See Bp. Stillingfleet, p. 142, and “Notes to the Introduction,” Note (B.)

faith." "Now these words certainly do not merely mean that she has authority to enforce such doctrines as can historically be proved to be Apostolical. They do not speak of her power of enforcing Truth, or of her power of enforcing at all, but say that she has 'authority in controversies;' whereas, if this authority depended on the mere knowledge of an historical fact, and much more if only on her persuasion in a matter of opinion, any individual of competent information has the same in his place and degree. The Church, then, according to this Article, has a power which individuals have not; a power, not merely as the ruling principle of a society, to admit and reject members, not simply a power of imposing tests, but simply 'authority in controversies of faith.' But how can she have this authority unless she be certainly true in her declarations? She can have no authority in declaring a lie. Matters of Doctrine are not like matters of usage or custom, founded on experience, and determinable by discretion. They appeal to the conscience, and the conscience is subject to Truth alone. It recognises and follows nothing but what comes to it with the profession of Truth. To say the Church has authority, and yet is not true, as far as it has authority, were to destroy liberty of conscience, which Protestantism in all its

forms holds especially sacred ; it were to substitute something besides Truth as the sovereign lord of conscience, which would be tyranny. If this Protestant principle is not surrendered in the Article, which no one supposes it to be, the Church is, to a certain point, there set forth as the organ or representative of Truth, and its teaching is identified with it.”¹

Again : our Church's reception of the Hymn of St. Athanasius is another proof of her holding the indefectibility of the Catholic Church in matters of saving faith. “ In that Creed it is unhesitatingly said, that certain doctrines are necessary to be believed, in order to salvation ; they are minutely and precisely described ; no room is left for Private Judgment ; none for any examination into Scripture, with the view of discovering them. Next, if we inquire the *ground* of this authority in the Church, the Creed answers, that she speaks merely as the organ of the *Catholic* voice, and that the faith thus witnessed is, as being thus witnessed, such, that whoso does not believe it faithfully, cannot be saved.² ‘Catholic,’ then, and ‘saving,’ are taken

¹ Newman's *Lectures on Romanism and Popular Protestantism*. Lect. viii. pp. 226, 227.

² “ Do we not read in our Service, the Athanasian Creed,

as synonymous terms ; in other words, the Church Catholic is pronounced to have been all along, and, by implication, as destined ever to be, the guardian of the pure and undefiled faith, or to be indefectible in that faith.”¹ To glance from the Formularies of the Church to the writings of her Martyrs and Doctors ;—Archbishop CRANMER remarks that “the Church doth never wholly err ;” and adds, in a passage already quoted, that the testimony of the Catholic Church, ascertained by the rule of Vincenius, “may be taken as a necessary witness for the receiving and establishing” of the faith.² FARRAR, HOOPER, COVERDALE, ROWLAND TAYLOR, PHILPOT, and BRADFORD, (in their famous Confession at Oxford, 1554,) assert that “the Catholic Church, which is the spouse of CHRIST, as a most obedient and loving wife, doth embrace and follow the doctrine of these Books [holy Scripture] in all matters of Religion, and, therefore, that she is to be heard accordingly . . . and,” they add, “we doubt not,

which, whether it allows private judgment or not, clearly propounds, that unless private judgment terminate in the reception of certain most definite statements of Doctrine, it incurs the Church’s direct and absolute anathema?”—*Brit. Critic*, No. XL. p. 385.

¹ Newman *On Romanism*, &c. Lect. viii. pp. 227, 228.

² P. 14.

by GOD's grace, but we shall be able to prove all our confession here to be most true, by the verity of GOD's Word, and consent of the Catholic Church."¹

FIELD unreservedly acknowledges the infallibility of the Catholic Church in matters of faith.² DONNE

recommends ; "To know which are the Scriptures, to know what the HOLY GHOST says in the Scriptures, apply thyself to the Church."³ LAUD says ; "That

the whole Church cannot universally err in the Doctrine of faith is most true."⁴ USHER remarks ;

"Now, these common principles of the Christian faith, which we call κοινόπιστα, or things 'generally believed' of all, as they have Universality, and

Antiquity, and Consent, concurring with them,

which, by Vincentius's rule, are the special cha-

racter of that which is truly and properly Catholic,

so for their duration we are sure that they have still

held out and been kept as the seminary of the

Catholic Church in the darkest and difficultest

times that ever have been."⁵ HEYLIN writes, "We

do believe that the Church is led by the SPIRIT of

GOD into all necessary truths ; and, being so

¹ P. 18.

² Pp. 39, 40.

³ P. 50.

⁴ P. 68.

⁵ Pp. 108, 109. The third edition of the Sermon (which was preached before King James, 20th June, 1624,) from whence the quotation there cited is taken, was published in 4to. 1631.

taught, becomes our Schoolmistress unto CHRIST, by making us acquainted with His will and pleasure ; and, therefore, that we are to yield obedience unto her decisions, determining according to the Word of GOD." And again ; " That the Universal Church should so fall away as to teach any doctrine contrary to the faith and Gospel, is plainly contradictory to the promise made by CHRIST our SAVIOUR."¹ TAYLOR remarks, " Then we speak according to the SPIRIT of GOD, when we understand Scripture in that sense in which the Church of GOD hath always practised it ;" and adds, that he who " leaves the way of the whole Church, hath no pretence for his error, no excuse for his pride, and will find no alleviation of his punishment."² BEVERIDGE asserts, that CHRIST " so acts, guides, directs, and governs [the Universal Church] by His HOLY SPIRIT, that though errors and heresies may sometimes disease and trouble some parts of it, yet they can never infect the whole ; but that is still kept sound and entire, notwithstanding all the power and malice of men or devils against it."³ Similar testimonies might be collected from the writings of CHILLINGWORTH, HAMMOND, BRAMHALL, PEARSON, and others.

¹ Pp. 94, 95.² P. 120.³ Pp. 173, 174.

The following are some of the texts which have been thought to assert the infallibility of the Catholic Church in all matters of saving faith.

“The Church of the living GOD, *the pillar and ground of the Truth.*”¹ “Upon this rock I will build My Church, *and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*”² “Go ye, therefore, and *teach* all nations; and lo, *I am with you alway*, even unto the end of the world.”³ “And I will pray the FATHER, and He shall give you another COMFORTER, that He may abide with *you for ever.*”⁴ “Howbeit, when He, the SPIRIT of Truth is come, He will guide you into *all Truth.*”⁵

It would be foreign to the design of this Introduction (which is rather to declare *what* the Anglican Church believes respecting Tradition, &c., than to exhibit the *grounds* of her belief) to discuss at any length the arguments which have been urged in proof of the Church's indefectibility. LAUD and BEVERIDGE concur in maintaining, that had she erred in fundamentals, “the gates of hell” would

¹ 1 Tim. iii. 15.

² St. Matt. xvi. 18.

³ St. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

⁴ St. John xiv. 16.

⁵ St. John xvi. 13.

fearfully have *prevailed* against her ; and that then the words of the Creed—" I believe in the HOLY Catholic Church"—would have been falsified, since "heresy is directly opposite to true holiness."¹ Other arguments may be drawn from the promises which our LORD vouchsafed to the Apostles collectively—" When He, the SPIRIT of Truth, is come, HE will guide you into all Truth." " Go ye, and teach all nations to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and *lo, I am with you.*" These words of CHRIST evidently exempt the Apostles from the peril of lapsing into fundamental error,—they assure them of the guidance of the HOLY GHOST into *all Truth*, and promise them the special assistance of their LORD—" *I will be with you*" for its promulgation. It is generally allowed that *the Apostles* were thus divinely guided and assisted, but have *any other persons* an assurance of *similar direction*? Surely, *the legitimate Successors of the Apostles*. This is clear from the expressions, " HE shall abide with you *for ever.*" " Lo, I am with you *always.*" Our SAVIOUR, it is evident, could not be with the first Disciples always as individuals, because they were subject to death :

¹ Pp. 68, 69, 72—pp. 173—174.

He could therefore be with *them alway* only as a body corporate, which never dies;—in this sense alone could the blessed SPIRIT abide with *them for ever*. It is plain that CHRIST did not promise to be merely with their *acts of Apostleship*; for He did not say, “Lo, I am with *teaching* alway;” but most emphatically, “Go YE *teaching*, and lo, I am with YOU *alway* ;” which shows, clearly as the sunbeam, that the Apostles were *necessarily* TO BE always, which can only be by succession as a corporate body, and such a succession as may justly be called *them*.¹ Now, since, (as we believe) “from the Apostles’ times there have been these orders of ministers in CHRIST’S Church, *Bishops*, Priests, and Deacons;”² and since the Catholic Prelates “in all lands”³ have descended from the first Apostles by an unbroken succession—we have the assurance of CHRIST that *these* shall teach “*all things whatsoever*” are necessary to salvation. Accordingly, if, by the light of History, we trace the fortunes of Christianity from its infancy to the present time, we

¹ See a Letter *On the Exclusive Power of an Episcopally-ordained Clergy to administer the Word and Sacraments*. Page 13. Cambridge, 1834. Also Bishop Beveridge’s Sermon on Matt. xxviii. 20. *Sermons*, Vol. I. p. 1. Fol. 1729.

² Preface to the Ordination Service Book. See post, p. 2.

³ Ps. xlv. 17. The Prayer-Book version.

shall find that the Catholic Church—"that which has, from age to age, borne rule upon the ground of its pretensions to Apostolical succession,"¹ has never authoritatively disowned any fundamental or essential truth of the Gospel. *Particular Churches* may have erred and perished, "but, as far as the Church *Catholic* can be deemed responsible, the substance of sound doctrine still remains undestroyed, at least, if not unimpaired."² Primitive Catholic Tradition, which the Apostles delivered, "once for all," to the Holy Spouse of CHRIST, is still *preserved* by the *present* universal Fold, although *particular* communions may have *partially* veiled its beauty by *human* additions, the poisonous fruits of *the abuse of private judgment*. The burnished splendours of the "shield of faith"

¹ See Bishop Van Mildert's *Eighth Bampton Lecture*.

² Ibid.

"The Church her ample bosom may expand—
Again contract—may open far and wide
Her tent, extend her cords, on either hand
Break forth, again into herself subside;
Alike with her Faith's oracles abide,
Revered by fickle worshipper, or spurn'd.
Oft faint, ne'er lost, the Lamp of Heaven supplied,
Oft dimm'd by envious mists, ne'er undiscern'd,
God's Witness thro' all time hath in His Temple burn'd."

Lyra Apostolica. The rule of faith.—See "Notes to the Introduction." Note (C.)

borne by the militant Church—though often sullied by the earth-born mists of spurious reason and false Philosophy—have never been wholly quenched. The Apostolic Ministry have ever effectually guarded the *foundation* of Christianity; whereas, *all* the sects who at different times have resisted the Catholic Priesthood, and separated themselves from the Bishops (that golden chain which binds the “successive generations of Christians to the first generation, the holy Apostles, and our LORD JESUS CHRIST Himself”), have, with a few exceptions, which are rapidly hastening to the same dark goal, sunk into deadly heresy, and trampled under foot the chalice of salvation!

V. But while our Spiritual Mother does steadfastly maintain the indefectibility of the Church Catholic, she as firmly withstands the doctrine of the Church's infallibility, as taught by her much erring, yet still dearly beloved, Sister.¹ The Romanist calls *that* the Catholic Church which *holds communion with the see of Rome*—we, “the Holy

Difference between the Romanists and Anglicans with regard to the Church's infallibility.

¹ “Speak gently of our *Sister's* fall:—

Who knows but gentle love
May win her, at our patient call,
The surer way to prove?”

Christian Year.

Church throughout all the world," *descended from the Apostles*. The Romanist contends that the present Church is an infallible *Judge* in every, the minutest detail of Doctrine and Discipline; that whatever this Church declares to be necessary to salvation, becomes, *by that simple declaration*, though unknown *before*, an Article of saving Truth; and that neither Scripture nor Tradition signify any thing apart from his Church's authority:—we assert, that the Church is an indefectible *preserver* of the grand features of primitive Apostolic Tradition, which, *at the first*, it was taught by the blessed SPIRIT of GOD. "This power of not erring," LAUD observes, "is not to be conceived as if it were in the Church *primo et per se*, originally, or by any power it hath of itself: for the Church is constituted of men, and 'humanum est errare,' all men can err. But this power is in it, partly by the virtue of this promise of CHRIST [St. Matt. xvi. 18], and partly by the matter which it teacheth, which is the unerring Word of GOD, so plainly and manifestly delivered to her as that it is not possible that she should universally fall from it, or teach against it, in things absolutely necessary to salvation."¹ "Let it suffice to tell you," says Bishop STILLINGFLEET,

¹ P. 68.

“we believe no Article of faith upon the Church’s infallible authority; [meaning *judicial* authority, as held by the Romanists] . . . we deny that any thing becomes an Article merely upon her account. But, now, if you remove the argument from the present Church’s infallible authority to the Universal Church’s testimony, we then tell you, that he who questions a clear, full, Universal Tradition of the whole Church, from CHRIST’S time to this, will, by the same reason, doubt of all matters of faith.”¹ It is, therefore, I repeat, as the faithful witness and keeper of Apostolical Doctrine, as “the very presence of Antiquity among us;”² that our Doctors and Masters admit the “*authority*” of the Church, and submit to her unerring decision in “controversies of faith.”

VI. Closely allied to the preceding topic is that equally important one, *the indefectibility of real Œcumenical Councils*, which next demands our attention. A real Œcumenical Council, in the judgment of the Catholic Church, must be first “duly assembled; second, freely celebrated; and third,

The indefectibility
of real
Œcumenical
Councils.

¹ P. 141.

² See *British Critic*, No. XL. p. 384; and “Notes to the Introduction.” Note (D.)

universally received." Such were the first six General Councils, whose decisions on every fundamental doctrine are acknowledged by the Anglican Church as the voice of God.¹

"We do not believe," says Dr. HAMMOND, in the name of the Church of England, "that any General Council, truly such, ever did or shall err in any matter of faith."² The twenty-first Article declares, that "General Councils, when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men whereof all be not governed with the SPIRIT and Word of God), *may err*."³ Similarly LAUD remarks—"That all General Councils, be they never so lawfully called, continued, and confirmed, have infallible assistance, I utterly deny:"

¹ That our Church makes particular mention of the first *four*, arises from the fact that they are *the* Repositories of all true Apostolical Tradition. This is expressly asserted by Dr. Hammond, who observes, that the Fathers in those Councils "fetched their definitions regularly from that Scripture, and that sense thereof, which the several Churches had received down from the Apostles, and so were approved and received *universally* in all Churches, not as those which had formed any new Articles, but which *conserved the* DEPOSITA *entrusted to the Churches* [by the Apostles]; and, in time of need, brought them forth and discovered them, to the securing of the truth against heretics."—See p. 86.

² P. 88.

³ P. 3.

and again; “That a General Council, *à parte ante*, when it first sits down and continues to deliberate, may truly be said to be infallible in all its after deliberations, I utterly deny.”¹ The meaning of the Article, and of the declarations of the Archbishop is, that no General Council, either collectively or individually, is, inherently and *à priori*, infallible; and this doctrine (which will be shown to be in no wise inconsistent with the above assertion of HAMMOND, and the unreserved submission given by our Church to the first six Councils) is maintained by all our standard divines. The Article goes on to say, that General Councils “sometimes *have* erred, even in things pertaining to God;” but since this cannot be affirmed, with any historical truth, of any *real* Œcumenical Council, the Article must be understood to speak *historically* of *pretended* General Councils, whose infallibility is asserted by the Romanists. A General Council, *truly such*, (which Hammond asserts never did nor shall err, in the great Christian verities,) must not only, I repeat, be lawfully called, and freely celebrated, but also *universally received*. “The claim of a Synod to the estimation of a *General*

¹ P. 72.

Council, depends *entirely* upon the *general* or *universal* reception of its decrees by the Catholic Church, and *no Council is to be accounted General or Universal whose decrees are not generally or universally received by the Catholic Church.*"¹ It is, therefore, the fiat of the Universal Church, the testimony borne to it by the Church throughout all the world, "*by the reception of its decrees,*" which renders a Council General; and it is this testimony alone which invests its decisions with that infallible authority which is possessed by the first six General Councils. "'Tis true," says LAUD, "that a General Council, *de post facto*, after 'tis ended, and *admitted by the whole Church*, is THEN infallible, for it cannot err in that which it hath already clearly and truly determined without error."² To recapitulate what has been said respecting the infallibility of General Councils. The judgment of the Anglican Church, as contained in her twenty-first Article, and illustrated by HAMMOND, LAUD, &c., appears to be this: A Council being composed of fallible men, may err in its decisions. A *General* Council, to become *truly* such, must be generally recognized by the Catholic Church. It is this

¹ Perceval *On the Roman Schism*, p. 17.

² P. 72.

reception of its decrees, by the Universal Fold, which stamps them with infallibility; and this, *only so far* as the Church Herself is indefectible.

VII. It next remains to be considered, *what* Traditions have been received *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*,¹ are, consequently, still acknowledged by the present Catholic Church, and allowed and revered by the Church of England.

What Traditions are received by the Church of England.

These may be comprehended under five general heads :

1. *The Tradition of holy Writ.*—"We receive," says FIELD, "the number and names of the authors of Books, Divine and Canonical, as delivered by Tradition. This Tradition we admit; for that, though the Books of Scripture have not their authority from the approbation of the Church, yet the number, authors, and integrity of the parts

¹ "The *highest* evidence of Apostolical Tradition is where the testimony is not only everywhere and always, but where it has ever been recognised *as* Tradition, and reflected upon and professedly delivered down as saving, by those who hold it. Such is the Creed, and such, in the way of ordinances, are the Sacraments, and certain other rites and usages."—Newman *On Romanism and Popular Protestantism*. Lect. X. p. 295.

of these Books we receive as delivered by Tradition.”¹ “This Tradition,” says PATRICK, “we own, it being universal, continued, uninterrupted, and undenied. Though, in truth, this is *Tradition* in another sense of the word; not signifying *the Doctrine delivered unto us*, but *the manner and means of its delivery*.”² The Church of England declares, in her twentieth Article, that the Catholic “Church is a witness and keeper of holy Writ;” and in her sixth Article, “In the name of the holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority *was never any doubt* in the Church” Catholic. The same Tradition which teaches us to distinguish holy Writ from all other writings, assures us likewise that it “*containeth all things necessary to salvation*.” *This* is the *main* pillar of the faith of our Anglican divines in the sufficiency of Scripture; and Bishop

¹ P. 43.

² P. 155. “This,” says the learned Bishop of Peterborough, “is a Tradition of *Testimony*, and has no connexion whatever with a Tradition of *Doctrine*. And it is so far from distinguishing the Church of Rome, or indeed *any Church whatever*, that it is applied to establish the authenticity of ancient writings *in general*. It is, moreover, a kind of Tradition, which is applied to the *Written Word*, whereas Tradition, as a rule of faith, applies exclusively to the *Unwritten Word*.”—*Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome*. Pp. 146, 147. Edit. 1814.

PATRICK nobly expresses their *concurrent* judgment when he remarks, “We [the Anglican Church] hold and assert, and maintain all those things which have always been, and are confessed by all Christians, the True, Ancient, Catholic and Apostolic faith, and the holy Scriptures, wherein this faith is originally contained. And if we knew any thing else to be the mind of God, delivered to us from CHRIST and His Apostles, by the Universal Church, we are prepared to receive it; and, did it appear, would immediately embrace and propagate it.” “If any thing *not contained in Scripture*, which the Roman Church now pretends to be a part of God’s Word, were delivered to us by as universal uncontrolled Tradition, as the Scripture is, *we should receive it as we do the Scripture*.” “But the Universal Church hath declared *this* to be sufficient, nay, *full and perfect*; and, moreover, forbidden any other faith to be either composed, or offered to those who would become Christians.”¹

2. “And, further, we likewise acknowledge, that the sum and substance of the Christian Religion, contained in the Scriptures, hath been delivered down to us, even from the Apostles’ days, in other

¹ Pp. 151—166, and “Notes to the Introduction.” Note (E.)

ways or forms besides the Scriptures. For instance, in the baptismal vow, in the Creed, in the Prayers and Hymns of the Church.”¹ This Tradition is no other than a “*System and Arrangement of fundamental Articles* ;”² “for though,” as FIELD observes of the Creed, “every part thereof be *contained* in Scripture, yet the orderly connexion and distinct explication of these principal Articles, gathered into an epitome wherein are implied, and whence are inferred, all conclusions theological, is rightly termed a Tradition.”³

3. “We reverently receive the unanimous Tradition or Doctrine of the Church in all ages, which *determines the meaning* of the holy Scripture. . . . We look upon this Tradition as nothing else but *Scripture unfolded* ; not a new thing, which is not in Scripture, but *the Scripture explained and made more evident*.”⁴ This Tradition is termed by HEYLIN, who follows FIELD, “the Catholic sense and interpretation of the Word of God, derived to us by the works and studies of the Fathers, *by them received from the Apostles*, and recommended to

¹ Bp. Patrick, p. 156.

² See Keble’s *Visitation Sermon*, p. 34.

³ P. 43.

⁴ Bp. Patrick, p. 156.

posterity.”¹ Such a Tradition are those parts of the Nicene Creed which declare the eternal generation and Sonship of CHRIST, and that there is “one Baptism *for the remission of sins.*” “And could there any traditive interpretation of the *whole* Scripture be produced upon the authority of such *Original Tradition* as that now named, we should most thankfully and joyfully receive it.”²

4. We admit of traditions *confirmatory of holy Scripture*, i. e. of those doctrines which may be proved by Scripture (with the help of Tradition), though not found in *express terms* there. For instance, “It would have been somewhat difficult,” says LAUD, “to find the collection out of Scripture only for the baptism of infants, since they do not actually believe; and therefore St. Augustine is at ‘*nec credenda nisi,*’ that this custom of the Church had not been to be believed, had it not been an *Apostolical tradition.* But the tradition being Apostolical, led on the Church easily to see the necessary deduction out of Scripture. And *this is not the least use of Tradition, to lead the Church into the true meaning of those things which are found in Scripture, though not obvious to every eye there.*”³

¹ P. 93.

² Bp. Patrick, p. 158.

³ P. 67.

Again, although the words of the Eucharistical consecration are in Scripture, we could not have been certified that they were *the* form which the Apostles *used*, had we not the assurance of the Primitive Liturgies, which all contain it, and no other.—“There are many things,” observes Bp. BEVERIDGE, “which, although they are not read in express and definite terms in the holy Scriptures, are yet by the common consent of all Christians drawn out of these Scriptures. For example; ‘*that there are in the ever blessed TRINITY three distinct Persons to be worshipped, the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY GHOST, and that these are each of them truly GOD, and yet that there is but one GOD; that CHRIST is GOD and man, θεάνθρωπος, truly GOD, and truly man, in one and the same person.*’ These, and such like, although they are not, either in the Old or New Testament, declared in so many words and syllables, yet have they, as founded on both, ever been agreed on by all Christians, certain few heretics only excepted, of whom no more account is to be had in Religion, than of monsters in nature. So also, *that infants are to receive the ablution of holy Baptism, and that sponsors are to be used for that Sacrament. That the LORD’S day, or the first day in every seven, is to be religiously observed as a*

festival. That our LORD's passion, resurrection, and ascension into heaven, as also the coming of the HOLY GHOST, are to be commemorated every year. That the Church is everywhere to be administered by Bishops, distinguished from Presbyters, and set over them.' These, and others of this sort, are nowhere in the sacred Scriptures enjoined directly and by name, yet have they, notwithstanding, during fourteen hundred years from the Apostles, been everywhere received into public use of the Church; nor can there be found any Church, during that period, not agreeing in these things. So that there have been, as it were, certain *common notions* from the beginning implanted in the minds of all Christians, not so much from any particular passages of holy Scripture, as from all; from the general scope and tenor of the whole Gospel; from the very nature and purpose of the Religion therein established; and, finally, *from the constant Tradition of the Apostles*, who, together with the faith, propagated ecclesiastical rites of this sort, and, if I may so speak, general interpretations of the Gospel."¹

V. Lastly, we allow also the traditions of the

¹ Pp. 176, 177.

Church, about matters of order, rites, and ceremonies ; but these we consider alterable and dispensable. Of this kind are those traditions which are referred to in the thirty-fourth Article.

To these may be added *pious opinions*, “ universally believed, and not contrary to Scripture, though not written at all there, nor to be proved from thence,” and therefore not to be imposed as Articles of faith. For example, the *perpetual virginity* of the blessed Mary, “ which,” says PATRICK, “ is so likely a thing, and so universally received, that I do not see why we should not look upon it as a genuine Apostolical tradition.”¹

What has been said must, I think, convince every unprejudiced mind, that although holy Scripture, in the judgment of the Anglican Church, is the sole Standard, Record, and Depository of saving Truth, and *in this sense* may rightly be termed the rule of faith ; yet that the written word, *as taught and interpreted by the Universal Church*, is to be our Guide in all matters of Religion, and that, therefore, *in this sense*, Scripture and Catholic Tradition constitute the *joint* Rule.

¹ P. 160.

“Scripture,” observes Mr. Newman, “is interpreted by Tradition, Tradition verified by Scripture ; Tradition gives form to the doctrine, Scripture gives life ; Tradition teaches, Scripture proves. And hence both the one and the other have, according to the occasion, been called by our writers the rule of faith [the Articles do not introduce the term, ‘rule of faith,’ at all] ; sometimes the Catholic Creed, sometimes Scripture ; not as if that particular source of Truth which was not mentioned at this or that time, was thereby excluded, but as implied throughout ; the question not lying between the Creed and Scripture, but relating to the Church and the individual. Scripture, when illuminated by the ‘Catholic Religion,’ or the Catholic Religion when fortified by Scripture, may either of them be called the Gospel committed to the Church, dispensed to the individual.”¹

It follows from the above statements that the Anglican Church maintains “that on certain definite subjects private judgment upon the text of Scripture has been superseded, but *not* [as we have seen] by the *authoritative sentence* of the Church,

¹ Newman, *On Romanism and Popular Protestantism*. Lect. XI. pp. 327, 328.

but by its *historical testimony* delivered down from the Apostles' time ;” but this decision must not be understood to deny the abstract right of private judgment as a political privilege,¹ nor the *legitimate exercise* of that right by persons duly qualified by prayer, leisure, and education for that most arduous task.² It must only be by the use of his reasoning faculties and his powers of discrimination, that a man can arrive at the *personal conviction* that, in *certain cases*, (in matters of inferior moment in Religion, both the Church and the individual have room to exercise their powers) the voice of Anti-

¹ “ I do not deny *the right of private judgment as a political privilege*, but to contend for it, as some persons do, as a sure Guide to Truth, is not only absurd, but cannot fail to involve those who do so in inconsistency as well as error.”—See *Five Sermons preached before the University of Oxford*, by W. F. Hook, D.D. Ser. II. p. 42.

² “ We have as little warrant for rejecting Ancient Consent as for rejecting Scripture itself; our private judgment is as much and as little infringed by the yoke of the Catholic sense as by the yoke of Scripture itself. Scripture is an infringement on our private judgment. It demands our assent; it threatens us if we refuse it; and towards it, too, we may exercise what we presumptuously call the right of private judgment. We may reject Scripture as we reject Antiquity, and we may take the consequences of what in the next world will be seen to be either unavoidable ignorance or self-will. It will be observed that I am speaking all along of *necessary doctrine*.”—Newman, *On Romanism and Popular Protestantism*. Lect. XI. p. 325.

quity is to be obeyed, in preference to the dictates of merely fallible opinion ; and *so far as his judgment is employed in fixing this conviction, it is as fully exercised, as when educating a system of Doctrine directly from Scripture.*¹ To say, however, that it is the *duty* of every individual to make even *this* investigation, is as absurd as to require the blind to see, the lame to walk, the dumb to speak, without first providing a cure for their several infirmities. And yet the great majority of men are equally *unqualified* to interpret *the Bible*. To contend for private judgment as a sure Guide to Truth is to fight against the universal experience of the Church of God. The mere *sincerity* of the inquirer will avail him little to discover the true meaning of Scripture, so long as he confides in himself or in some heavenly promise misunderstood,² and refuses to “hear the Church,” “the Pillar and Ground of Truth.”³

Every error that has sullied the holy flame of Christianity—every sect which has disturbed its “living” waters—has originated in the preference

¹ See “Notes to the Introduction,” Note (F).

² See “Notes to the Introduction,” Note (G).

³ St. Matt. xviii. 17. 1 Tim. iii. 15.

of private opinion to Primitive Tradition. Schism gives birth to Spiritualism and Rationalism, and these degenerate into infidelity.¹ Geneva, the scene of Calvin's stern dominion, now glories in professing the damning doctrines of Servetus. Germany—the nurse of continental sectarianism—has virtually rejected even the semblance of Religion.² If we seek for the representatives of that once powerful party in our own country, whose watchword was the “League and Covenant,” and whose Creed, the “Assembly's Catechism,” we shall find them lurking in the haunts of Arius and Socinus.³ And what, short of a miraculous interposition, shall preserve those from a similar apostasy, who have already so far forsaken the faith of their nonconforming ancestors as to declare in an authorized Formulary, that the DEITY is revealed “*as FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST.*”⁴

¹ The steps of descent from Schism to Infidelity are powerfully traced by the Rev. W. J. Irons, M.A. in his IVth Lecture on the Holy Catholic Church. See “Notes to Introduction.” Note (H).

² See Mr. Pearson's pamphlet on *The Danger of Abrogating Religious Tests, &c.* pp. 11—16.

³ *Ibid.* p. 25. It is stated by a writer in the British Magazine for April 1834, that “out of TWO HUNDRED AND SIX chapels, possessed by the Socinians at the close of 1824, in England alone, *one hundred and seventy* were ORIGINALLY ORTHODOX.”—P. 455.

⁴ See “Notes to the Introduction.” Note (I).

Such are the consequences of the doctrine of personal infallibility!—and how must we pity the votaries of this soul-destroying delusion when we remember that the bulk of those persons who are most vehement in its praises, and most depraved by its influence, *never exercise* their “right of private judgment,” but are bound hand and foot by the shackles of *human Tradition*! Their religious opinions receive their tone and colouring from the sect to which, by the accident of birth, they belong. They admit as infallible the *dicta* of some presumptuous Heresiarch; and while they fondly believe they are searching the Bible with minds totally unbiassed, their sight is distorted by educational prejudice, and therefore they necessarily, though (we may hope) unwittingly, pervert the sacred text till it seems to countenance their *pre-conceived system* of Theology.

And so long as the human mind is constituted as it now is,—so long as the labours and cares and pleasures of life engross so entirely the attention of mankind,—the great majority will instinctively adhere to an *inherited system*, whether of Truth or error. It is idle to magnify the right of private judgment—a mere visionary privilege at best—

since *the many* are so totally unqualified to exercise it. “While all have been capable of understanding Truth, when proposed to them, few, comparatively, have been entrusted with the power of distinguishing between Truth and error, otherwise than they have been taught.”¹ Such is the wise and inscrutable arrangement of Providence. Is it then unreasonable—at variance with the mercy of God, or the position and true dignity of man—to believe that the Catholic Church (which we are historically sure *has* never erred in essentials) is the appointed Guardian and Sacramental Teacher of all necessary and saving Truth. Shall we scruple to allow this when we know what have *ever* been the ultimate consequences of despising her “authority?”—and above all, shall we hesitate to admit this as the dutiful children and sworn defenders of the Holy Church in England?

And would the Clergy be guided by the Formularies to which they have set their hands—would the lay-members of our communion become not merely by name and profession, but “verily and indeed” Churchmen, how happy, great, and

¹ See Dr. Pusey’s admirable Work on *Holy Baptism*. Preface, p. iv.

glorious might be the result of their *consistency*! The Church would no longer be made the arena of polemical conflict—primitive principles and practices would revive and flourish throughout her sacred borders—the Pilgrim, as of old, might journey from city to city and from village to village, and find in the Homily of the Priest no less than in the Catholic Offices, one faith in accordance with the “Law, the Prophets, and the Lord,”¹—then, as of old, would nothing be done without the chief shepherds of the flock,²—then as of old, would the “Mystery of Grace,” the Commemorative Sacrifice³ of the Eucharist, be at the least weekly solemnized; the festivals of the Church celebrated with meek and holy joy, and the matin and vesper chime daily summon a willing population to kneel in the shrines of their fathers.

And when this time of reformation shall have dawned upon the Church of England—when she shall have girded on the sword of Apostolic discipline, and taken in her hand the staff of Apostolic authority—when she shall have arrayed herself, as

¹ Euseb. Lib. IV. c. 22.

² St. Ignatius's Exhortation to the Magnesians.

³ See “Notes to the Introduction.” Note (K).

with a garment, in the high-souled heroism, faith, love, and purity of the Primitive Church, and stand forth before the world a form of brightness, such as hath never been beheld since the days of IGNATIUS and POLYCARP—may we not hope that the Romanists, beholding so glorious a spectacle, might recall the objectionable decrees of the Synod of Trent; claim for Tradition no more than is justly its due; effect a reunion with their erring brethren in the East; and return with them to the “faith and fear” of the first four centuries: whilst, at the same time, the tired Protestant Sectaries, of every denomination, might seek like the son in the parable to be reconciled to their Parent and Friend; so that the *Sacramentum Unitatis* being again restored to the Fold of CHRIST, we might fully realize the sublime declaration of an Apostle, “One LORD, ONE *Faith*, one Baptism!”¹

¹ Eph. iv. 5.

NOTES TO INTRODUCTION.

NOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION.

NOTE A, p. vi.

AND herein our Church agrees with the *letter* of the decree of the Synod of Trent, which declares that “the Gospel is contained in Scripture and unwritten Tradition,” and therefore,—
“Omnes libros tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti, cum utriusque unus DEUS sit auctor, necnon traditiones ipsas tum ad fidem tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel oretenus à CHRISTO, vel à SPIRITU SANCTO dictatas, et continuâ successione in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ conservatas, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentiâ suscipit et veneratur.” See Perceval, *On the Roman Schism*, pp. 159, 160, and pp. 361, 362: also post, p. 162, Note, where the subject is resumed. In further confirmation of the statement in the text, I shall enrich my pages with the following remarks of the learned and truly Catholic Dr. KAYE, Bishop of Lincoln. “If,” says his Lordship, “we mistake not the signs of the times, the period is not far distant, when the whole controversy between the English and Roman Churches will be revived, and all the points in dispute brought under review. Of those points none is more important than the question respecting Tradition; and it is, therefore, most essential that they who stand forth as

the defenders of the Church of England should take a correct and rational view of the subject; the view, in short, which was taken by our divines at the Reformation. Nothing was more remote from their intention than indiscriminately to condemn all Tradition. They knew that, in strictness of speech, Scripture is Tradition—written Tradition. They knew that, as far as external evidence is concerned, the Tradition preserved in the Church is the only ground on which the genuineness of the Books of Scripture can be established. For though we are not, upon the authority of the Church, bound to receive as Scripture any book, which contains internal evidence of its own spuriousness—such as discrepancies, contradictions of other portions of Scripture, idle fables, or precepts at variance with the great principles of morality—yet no internal evidence is sufficient to prove a book to be Scripture, of which the reception, by a portion at least of the Church, cannot be traced from the earliest period of its history to the present time. What our reformers opposed was the notion, that men must, upon the mere authority of Tradition, receive, as necessary to salvation, doctrines not contained in Scripture. Against this notion in general, they urged the incredibility of the supposition that the Apostles, when unfolding *in their writings* the principles of the Gospel, should have entirely omitted any doctrines essential to man's salvation. The whole tenor indeed of those writings, as well as of our blessed LORD's discourses, runs counter to the supposition that any truths of fundamental importance would be suffered long to rest upon so precarious a foundation as that of oral Tradition. With respect to the peculiar doctrines, in defence of which the Roman Catholics appeal to Tradition, our reformers contended that some were directly at variance with Scripture; and that others, far from being supported by an unbroken chain of Tradition from the Apostolic ages, were of very recent origin, and utterly unknown to the early Fathers. Such was the view of this important question taken by our reformers. In this, as in other instances, they wisely adopted a middle course: they neither bowed submissively to the authority of Tradition, nor yet rejected it altogether. We in the

present day must tread in their footsteps and imitate their moderation, if we intend to combat our Roman Catholic adversaries with success. We must be careful that, in our anxiety to avoid one extreme, we run not into the other by adopting the extravagant language of those who, not content with ascribing a paramount authority to the Written Word on all points pertaining to eternal salvation, talk as if the Bible—and that too the Bible in our English translation—were, independently of all external aids and evidence, sufficient to prove its own genuineness and inspiration, and to be its own interpreter.—*Ecclesiastical History of the Second and Third Centuries, illustrated from the writings of Tertullian*, pp. 299—304. 2d Edit.

NOTE B, p. xi.

The following are the passages in the Commentary of St. Vincent to which, in particular, our Anglican Divines refer.

“In ipsa item Catholica Ecclesia magnopere curandum est, ut id teneamus, *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus* creditum est. (Hoc est etenim vere proprièque Catholicum, quod ipsa vis nominis ratioque declarat, quæ omnia fere universaliter comprehendit) sed hoc ita demum fiet : si sequamur *Universitatem, Antiquitatem, Consensionem*. Sequemur autem *Universitatem* hoc modo, si hanc unam fidem veram esse fateamur, quam tota per orbem terrarum confitetur Ecclesia : *Antiquitatem* vero ita, si ab his sensibus nullatenus recedamus, quos sanctos Majores ac Patres nostros celebrasse manifestum est : *Consensionem* quoque itidem ; si in ipsa vetustate, omnium vel certe pene omnium Sacerdotum pariter et Magistrorum definitiones sententiasque sectemur. Sed dicet aliquis : Si divinis eloquiis, sententiis, promissionibus, et diabolus, et discipuli ejus utuntur, quorum alii sunt Pseudo-apostoli et Pseudo-prophetæ, et Pseudo-magistri, et omnes ex toto heretici ; quid facient Catholici homines et matris Ecclesiæ filii ? quonam modo in scripturis sanctis veritatem à falsitate discernent ? Hoc scilicet facere magnopere curabunt, quod in

principio *Commonitorii* istius sanctos et doctos viros nobis tradidisse scripsimus : ut *divinum Canonem secundum Universalis Ecclesiæ traditiones, et juxta Catholici dogmatis regulas interpretentur. In qua item Catholica et Apostolica Ecclesia sequantur necesse est universitatem, antiquitatem, consensionem. Et si quando pars contra universitatem, novitas contra vetustatem, unius vel paucorum errantium dissensio contra omnium vel certe multo plurium Catholicorum consensionem rebellaverit, præferant partis corruptioni universitatis integritatem* : in qua eadem universitate, novitatis prophanitati antiquitatis religionem : itemque in ipsa vetustate, unius sive paucissimorum temeritati, primum omnium generalia, siquæ sunt, Universalis Concilii decreta præponant ; tunc deinde, si id minus est, sequantur, quod proximum est, multorum atque magnorum consentientes sibi sententias Magistrorum : quibus adjuvante. DOMINO fideliter, sobrie, sollicite observatis, non magna difficultate, noxios quosque exsurgentium hæreticorum deprehendemus errores.”—*Commonitorium*, ii. xxvii. pp. 6, 7 ; 68, 69. Oxford Edit. 1836.

“But to say no more of mere authorities, however strong,” observes Bp. JEBB, “I own I cannot at present feel any difficulty in applying Vincentius’s rule. If a doctrine is propounded to me as vitally essential, that is, to speak technically, as matter of faith, before I can receive it as such, I must go to the Catholic succession, and ascertain whether that doctrine has been held *semper, ubique, ab omnibus* : convinced, if it has not been so held, my assent is not due to it as *matter of faith*. If, again, a doctrine which I hold, is impugned as heretical, next to the Scripture, and as interpretative of Scripture, I must go to the Catholic succession : and if I find this doctrine universally asserted, I cannot believe that it is any other than the sincere truth of the Gospel. The universality here mentioned, is not, of course, a *mathematical*, but a *moral* universality : the universality, to use Vincentius’s own words, of those *Qui in fide et communione Catholicâ, sancte sapienter et constanter viventes, vel mori in CHRISTO fideliter, vel occidi pro CHRISTO feliciter meruerint*. And here, I may observe, that Vincentius

himself has anticipated your great objection ; a very fair one, no doubt, and which requires, and deserves an answer ;—namely, ‘that true Christianity, far from being diffused *ubique*, or received *ab omnibus*, was sometimes confined to a very narrow channel : when the great majority of the Bishops were Arians, what becomes of this rule ?’ Let Vincentius answer, *Quid si novella aliqua contagio, non jam portiunculam tantum, sed totam pariter Ecclesiam commaculare conetur. Tunc item providebit ut Antiquitati inhæreat.* Nor be it thought, that by this means, the *quod ubique*, and *quod ab omnibus*, are idly absorbed in the *quod semper* : they are, as above hinted, to be taken, not mathematically, but morally ; and, so taken, they are an effectual guard to the *quod semper*. From the beginning, or, at least, from very remote antiquity, worthy individuals have frequently held, some one or more, unsound opinions ; and looking to individuals merely, the *quod semper* might be alleged, as it has been alleged, in favour of every opinion : it is to be rectified, however, by looking to *universality* and *consent* : not *universality without exception*—for such is not to be found : but the *concurrent, and consistent sentiments, of the most, and greatest, Doctors, in the whole body of the Church : not at any given period, but throughout the whole Succession.* Nor will such a research be so laborious as might be imagined ; for, in the first place, the Catholic verities, those to be believed for necessity of salvation, are but few ; and in the next place, the concurrent sense of Catholic Christians, on those few, but important points, has been amply elicited by controversy ; insomuch that, from the works of Bishop Bull, and a very few more, any candid and intelligent student might obtain competent and intelligent satisfaction, respecting the sense of the universal Church, on any and every of the Catholic verities. As to all other verities, and as to the interpretation of particular texts of Scripture, they are left at large, provided always that no Catholic truth be impugned, and that the analogy of the faith be maintained inviolable.—*Letter to Dr. Nash.—Foster’s Life, &c. of Bp. Jebb, Vol. II. p. 249.*

A Roman Catholic pamphlet, recently published, advances the

following "reason" to prove that a doctrine that is *now* held as of faith, by the Roman Catholic Church, must *always*, in every age, have been received as a point divinely revealed. "I shall appeal," says the writer, "only to one *fact* which I see before me, a fact for which I can conceive no satisfactory cause, but the indefectibility of Tradition as a mode of delivering the doctrines of CHRIST. The effect or fact which I shall fix upon, is one of noon-day notoriety; namely, *the actual conviction* of all [Roman] Catholics, *that their faith has descended uninterruptedly from CHRIST and His Apostles*. This persuasion is firmly rooted in our hearts; it is common to the most learned, and the most ignorant; it is this that gives security to our faith; it is, in a word, an uniform and universal effect, the existence of which must strike every observer, and for which I shall endeavour to prove, that it is impossible to account, without admitting, as its necessary cause, the actual indeficiency of Tradition, in every age of the Church. I come to this conclusion from the two following clear principles.

"1. *That age which asserts faith to be unchangeable, and which holds its faith to have been delivered uninterruptedly from the Apostles, neither can itself have changed that faith, nor believe or suspect even, that, in any preceding age, that faith has undergone any change or alteration whatever.* This proposition needs only to be well understood, to be at once admitted. For no single individual even can sincerely believe any thing which is contrary to his conviction and knowledge, nor can he change a doctrine, or bring in any innovation without knowing it; much less, therefore, can an entire age or generation fall into an absurdity, of which even one rational being is incapable.

"2. *No age could introduce a new doctrine, and yet deliver that very doctrine to the succeeding generation, as having been received by it from the preceding age, and taught and held by all ages, in uninterrupted succession, from the time of CHRIST.* The attempt would involve a practical impossibility, and would clearly be an action without a motive. It is evidently impossible that an *entire* age should conspire to do this, and if all do not join in the attempt, the attempt would at once be dis-

covered, and divulged, by those who opposed it, to posterity. I want but these two principles to arrive at my main conclusion, as before stated."—No well-informed Catholic, however, will admit the above "principles," and if it can be shown that they are false, the "main conclusion" of this subtle Romanist of course falls to the ground.

With reference to his first, I would inquire—If this position be true, why was it necessary to summon General Councils? Did not the great Catholic doctrines of the TRINITY and the Incarnation become so "changed" and disputed *within the pale of the Church*, that it became necessary for the Heads of her several branches to meet in solemn conclave, in order to stem the tide of innovation by declaring that form of sound words which had been at the first, and once for all, delivered to the Church by the Apostles? Surely if the most important tenets of Christianity were in danger of being "changed" or lost in the Church herself—doctrines of minor importance—to settle which *no* General Council was called—might *gradually*, nay *imperceptibly*, become "changed" and corrupted, and so gradually and imperceptibly that it might be impossible to show *when* the change was introduced.

The Romanist's second position looks well at first sight, but it will not bear to be analyzed. Were each generation *perfectly distinct* from any other, and had each, since the age of the Apostles, on departing from the world at a given time, delivered a complete Deposit of Doctrine to its successor, *then*, indeed, it might appear plausible that the faith of the present age agreed in all particulars with the faith of the Apostolic. But what is the fact? Does not one generation *blend so entirely* with the next succeeding generation, that *no line of demarcation* can strictly be drawn between them? And if the distinction between the ages be so imperceptible, why may not the rise and progress of error, as we have before observed, be equally so? We cannot accurately distinguish every shade that blends day with night, although we are in no danger of mistaking one for the other: just so, we may be unable to show, *in every case*, the gradations of error which intervened between Catholicism and Romanism,

although we can see at a glance the mighty difference which exists between the sunny splendour of the former, and the midnight darkness of the latter.

NOTE C, p. xx.

Even LUTHER allowed, that in the darkest times of the Papacy, the Catholic Church preserved the essentials of Christianity. He says: "DEUS admirabili sua potentia fecit, ut in Papatu permaneret primum sacrum baptismus; deinde textus sacri Evangelii in cujusque nationis idiomate de suggestu recitari solitus; tertio sacra peccatorum remissio et absolutio tam privatim in confessione, quam publice; quarto, sanctissimum Altaris sacramentum. Multi morem hunc retinuerunt, animam agentibus, ostensa crucifixi imagine, memoriam passionis CHRISTI renovandi, ut in CHRISTI morte fiduciam omnem sibi collocandam intelligerent. Ubi ergo ejusmodi capita remanserunt, ibi certissime etiam Ecclesia, et aliquot sancti mansuerunt." Lib. de Missa private, Tom. VI. Ienen. fol. 92. Again: "Cogimur Papistis tam multa largiri et concedere, quoniam vera sunt; in Papatu scilicet esse DEI Verbum, Apostolatum, nosque sacram Scripturam, sacramenta, et predicandi officium ab illis sumpsisse, alioquin quid de istis omnibus nos sciremus? Cogimur itaque dicere; Credo, et certus sum etiam in Papatu Ecclesiam CHRISTI permansisse."—Tom. VII. Ien. fol. 169.

NOTE D, p. xxiii.

The commission given to the Apostles and their Successors did not empower them to determine what should or should not *thereafter* become Articles of faith: it merely gave them an infallible authority as *witnesses* to "all things whatsoever" *had* been committed to them, *once for all*, by their Divine Master. "Go ye, and teach all things whatsoever I *have* commanded you: and lo," &c.

“The Church,” says Mr. Newman, “is not a *judge* of the sense of Scripture, in the common sense of the word, but a *witness*. If, indeed, the word judge be taken to mean what it means in the Courts of Law, one vested with authority to declare the received appointments and usages of the realm, and with power to enforce them, then the Church is a judge,—but not of Scripture, but of Tradition. On the contrary, both Protestant sectaries and Romanists consider their supposed judges to be a judge not merely of past facts, of precedents, custom, belief, and the like, but to have a direct power over Scripture, to contemplate questions of what is *true* and *false* in opinion, to have a special gift by Divine illumination, a gift guaranteed by promise, of discerning the Scripture sense without perceptible human *Media*, to act under a guidance, and as if inspired, though not really so. Whether any such gift was once destined for mankind or not, it avails not to inquire; we consider it is not given in fact, and both Romanists and [ultra] Protestants hold it is given. We, on the other hand, consider the Church as a witness, a keeper and witness of Catholic Tradition, and, in this sense, invested with authority, just as in political matters, an ambassador, possessed of instructions from his government, would speak with authority. But, unless in such sense as attaches to an ambassador, the Church, in our view of her office, is not a judge. She bears witness to a fact, that such and such a doctrine has ever been received and came from the Apostles; the proof of this lies, first, in her own unanimity throughout her various branches, next, in the writings of the Ancient Fathers; and she acts upon this her witness as the executive does in civil matters, and is responsible for it; but she does not undertake of herself to determine the sense of Scripture,—she has no immediate power over it, she but alleges and submits to what is ancient and Catholic. The mere Protestant, indeed, and the Romanist, may use Antiquity; but it is as a mere material by which the supreme judge, the spiritual mind, whether collective or individual, forms his decisions, as pleadings in his Court, he being above them, and having an inherent right of disposing of them. We, on the contrary, consider

Antiquity and Catholicity to be the real Guides, and the Church their organ."—*Lectures on Romanism, &c.* Lect. XI. pp. 320—322.

NOTE E, p. xxix.

"From all this I gather, that in the interval between Clement and Ignatius on the one hand, Irenæus and Tertullian on the other, the Canon of the New Testament had first become fixed and notorious, and then the fact had been observed, which is stated in our Article: That every fundamental point of doctrine is contained in the unquestioned Books of that Canon, taken along with the Hebrew Scriptures. And this observation, being once made, would, of course, immediately suggest that golden rule, not of the Anglican only, but of the Catholic Church;—That nothing is to be insisted on as a point of faith necessary to salvation, but what is contained in, or may be proved by, Canonical Scripture. At any rate, it is unquestionable, that by the time of Irenæus, *i. e.* towards the end of the second century, the fact had been universally recognised, and the maxim thoroughly grounded and incorporated into the system of the Catholic Church."—Keble's *Visitation Sermon*, pp. 30, 31. "If asked, how I know that the Bible contains all truth necessary to be believed in order to salvation, I simply reply, as the first Homily implies, that the early Church so accounted it, that there is a 'consent of Catholic Fathers' in its favour. No matter, whether or not we can see a principle in it; no matter, whether or not we can prove it from reason or Scripture; we receive it simply on historical evidence. The early Fathers so held it; and we throw the burden of our belief, if it be a burden, on them. It is quite impossible they should so have accounted it, except from Apostolic intimations, that it was so to be. Stronger evidence for its truth is scarcely conceivable; for, if any but the Scripture had pretensions to be an oracle of faith, would not the first Successors of the Apostles be that oracle?—Must not they, if any, have possessed the authoritative traditions of the Apostles? They surely must have felt, as

much as we do, the unsystematic character of the Epistles, the silence of Scripture on the doctrine of its own Canonicity, or whatever other objections can be now urged against the doctrine; and yet they certainly held it.

“If this line of argument can be maintained, there will be this especial force in it as addressed to Romanists. They are accustomed to taunt us with inconsistency, as if we used the Tradition of the Church only, when and as far as we could not avoid it; for instance, for the establishment of the Divinity of Scripture, but not for the doctrines of the Gospel. ‘Were it not for the testimony of the Church,’ they say, ‘we should not know what Books are, what Books are not, inspired; they do not speak for themselves; or, at least, when they do, they scarcely can be admitted as their own vouchers. Yet a Protestant will quote them implicitly as Divine, while he scoffs and rails at that informant to whom he is indebted for his knowledge.’ Protestants have felt the cogency of this representation; and have been led to explore other modes of proving the genuineness of the New Testament, which might set them free from the first ages of Christianity. Paley, for instance, has shown from the undesigned coincidences of the Acts and Epistles, that they bear with them an internal evidence of their truth. Others have enlarged upon what they conceive to be the beautiful and wise adaptation of the Christian doctrines to each other, which, in the words of one writer, is such as to show that ‘the system’ of the Apostles ‘is true in the nature of things, even were they proved to be impostors.’¹ Ingenious as such arguments are, were they ever so sound and reverent, as they are generally irreverent, and often untenable, they do not touch the question of the Divine origin of the New Testament itself, except very indirectly, nay, sometimes tend to dispense with it. Yet, allowing what force we will to them, I suppose it is undeniable, after all, that we *do* receive the New Testament, in its existing shape, on Tradition, not on such refinements; for instance, we include the Second Epistle of St. Peter, we leave

¹ Erskine’s Internal Evidence, p. 17.

out St. Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians, simply because the Church Catholic has done so. Now this objection, whatever be its value, is fully met by the mode of proof which I have suggested; or, rather, a point is gained thereby. We do *not* discard the Tradition of the Fathers; we accept it; we accept it entirely; we accept its witness concerning itself and against itself; it witnesses to its own inferiority to Scripture; it witnesses not only that Scripture is the record, but that it is the sole record of saving Truth.

“This is the more remarkable, from the great stress which the Fathers certainly do lay on the authority of Tradition. They so represent it in its Apostolical and universal character, they so extol and defer to it, that it is difficult to see why they do not make it, what the Romanists make it, an independent informant in matters of faith; yet they do not. Whenever they formally prove a doctrine, they have recourse to Scripture; they bring forward Tradition first; they use it as a strong antecedent argument against individual heretics who profess to quote Scripture; but in Councils, they ever verify it by the written Word. Now, if we choose to argue and dispute, we may call them inconsistent, and desire an explanation; but, if we will be learners in the school of CHRIST, we shall take things as we find them, we shall consider their conduct as a vestige and token of some Apostolic appointment, from its very singularity. It is nothing to the purpose, even though Catholic and Apostolic Tradition be strong enough to sustain the weight of an appeal, supposing, in matter of fact, it was not so employed by the early Church. CHRIST surely may give to each of His instruments its own place; He has vouchsafed us two informants in saving Truth, both necessary, both at hand, Tradition for statement, Scripture for proof; and it is our part rather to thank Him for His bounty, than to choose one and reject the other. Let us be content to accept the Canonicity of Scripture on *faith*.”—Newman *On Romanism, &c.* Lect. XI. pp. 339—343.

NOTE F, p. xxxvii.

“ Vincentius,” says Bp. JEBB, “ in perfect unison with the Church of England, proposes to *assist*, not *supersede*, the faculty of Private Judgment. This dissimilarity between the Catholic Church of the fifth century and the modern Church of Rome, deserves particular attention. The Church of Rome sends her children to no approachable standard, because her own summary decision is their first and last authority. To this dictation they must implicitly submit, or they are undutiful, rebellious children. And, in this manner, the rule of Vincentius is not simply neglected but directly violated, and flagrantly counteracted. For what are the words of Vincentius? ‘ *Sive EGO, sive ALIUS, whether I MYSELF, OR ANY OTHER PERSON, wish to detect the frauds, and shun the snares, of rising heretics, he must, through Divine assistance, fortify his faith in a twofold manner, by the authority of the Divine Law, and by the Tradition of the Church.*’ This language cannot be mistaken: SIVE EGO, SIVE ALIUS: that is, each individual member of the Church is to look to his own faith; each individual is to guard for himself his own faith, by his own best and wisest exertions, by his own application of Scripture, by his own examination of Antiquity.”—Appendix to *Sermons chiefly practical*, pp. 371, 372. This is *theoretically* true, and may be urged against Dissenters and others who, because our Church maintains that, on certain points, private judgment *upon the text of Scripture* is superseded—misrepresent her to say, that the exercise of private judgment is superseded *altogether* in matters of Religion: but, *in point of fact*, not one man in a thousand is *qualified* “to guard for himself his own faith,” either “by his own application of Scripture,” or “by his own examination of Antiquity.”

NOTE G, p. xxxvii.

“ Now, if its advocates are asked on what grounds they conceive that Scripture is, under God’s grace, the *one* ordained informant in saving Truth, I suppose they will refer to such

texts as our LORD's words to the Jews, 'Search the Scriptures;' or to St. Paul's, 'All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for Doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works;' or to St. Luke's account of CHRIST's 'opening' His Apostles' 'understanding, that they might understand the Scripture;' or to St. James's telling us 'to ask for wisdom of God, who giveth liberally;' or to our LORD's assurance, 'Ask, and it shall be given you;' or to St. Paul's statement, that 'the natural man receiveth not the things of the SPIRIT of God;' or to our LORD's promise to the twelve, that the HOLY GHOST the COMFORTER 'should guide them into all Truth;' or to the prophet Isaiah's prediction, 'All thy children shall be taught of the LORD;' or to St. John's declaration, 'Ye have an unction from the HOLY ONE, and ye know all things.' Yet after all, can any one text be produced, or any comparison of texts, to establish the very point in hand, that Scripture is the sole necessary instrument of the HOLY GHOST for guiding the individual Christian into saving Truth? for it may be very true that we ought to search the Scriptures, and true that Scripture contains all saving Doctrine, and true that we cannot understand it without the HOLY SPIRIT, and true that the HOLY SPIRIT is given to all who ask, and true that all perfect Christians do understand it; and yet there may not be such connexion between these separate propositions as to make it true that men are led by the HOLY SPIRIT into saving Truth *through* the Scriptures. We may be bound to search the Scriptures, yet not to find saving doctrines, but chiefly to be thoroughly 'furnished unto *all good works*;' it may contain all saving Doctrine, yet so deeply lodged there, that 'those who are *unlearned* and unstable may wrest it unto their own destruction;' the HOLY GHOST may be promised to all Christians, yet not in order to teach them the *faith* through *Scripture*, but in order to impress Scripture on their hearts, and to teach them the faith through *whatever* sources. Let us inspect some of the foregoing texts more narrowly.

"First, there are texts which bid us ask wisdom of God, and

promise that it shall be granted.¹ It is true ; but this does not show that the *private* reading of *Scripture* is the *one* essential requisite for gaining it. If such texts are taken by themselves, they would rather prove that *no* external means at all is necessary ; not even *Scripture*, for *Scripture* is not mentioned. To be consistent, we ought to call the *Scripture* an outward form as well as the Church, and to say that ‘asking,’ in other words prayer, is alone necessary. If then one external means of information is admitted, as intervening between the HOLY GHOST and the soul, though it is not mentioned, why not another ? When CHRIST says, ‘Ask, and ye shall find,’ He does not specify the *mode* of seeking : He means, as we may suppose, by all methods which are vouchafed to us, and are otherwise specified. He includes the Church, which is called ‘the pillar and ground of the Truth.’ Our Service applies the promise to seeking God in Baptism : and as it may include the use of the Sacraments, so may it include the use of Catholic teaching.

“ Again, no Christian can doubt that without Divine grace we cannot discern the sense of *Scripture* profitably ; but it does not follow from this, that with it we can gain every thing from *Scripture*. The grace of God seems to be promised us chiefly for practical purposes ; for enabling us to receive what we receive, —whatever it is, Doctrine or precept, or from whatever quarter, —profitably, with a lively faith, with love and zeal. If it supersede Creeds, why should it not supersede Sacraments ? it acts through Sacraments, and in like manner it acts through Creeds. Sacraments, without the presence of the HOLY GHOST, would sink into mere Jewish rites ; and Creeds, without a similar presence, are but a dead letter. The appointment of Sacraments is in *Scripture*, and so is the proof of the Creed ; yet *Scripture* is no more a Creed than it is a Sacrament. By continuous Tradition we have received the Sacraments embodied in a certain definite form ; and by a like Tradition we have received the doctrines also. *Scripture* may justify both the one and the other when given, without being sufficient to lead individuals to

¹ St. Matt. vii. 7. St. James i. 5.

frame and observe them before they are given. Besides, if the HOLY SPIRIT illuminates the Word of GOD to the individual in all things, then, of course, as regards unfulfilled prophecy also; which we know is not the case. As, then, for all that the SPIRIT is given, yet the event is necessary to interpret prophecy; so in like manner a similar external fact may be necessary for understanding Doctrine. True then though it be, that ‘the natural man discerneth not the things of the SPIRIT of GOD;’ it does not therefore follow, that the spiritual man discerneth spiritual things through Scripture only, not through Creeds.

“Lastly, there are texts which recite the various purposes for which Scripture is useful; but it does not follow that no medium is necessary for its becoming useful to individuals. Scripture may be profitable for Doctrine, instruction, and correction, that the man of GOD may be perfect, without thereby determining at all whether or not there are instruments for preparing, dispensing, and ministering the Word for this or that purpose which it is to effect. Certainly CHRIST says, ‘Search the Scriptures;’ but He is speaking to the Jews about their Scriptures, and about definite prophecies: how does it follow, that because it was the duty of the Jews to examine documents as prophecies, which profess to be prophecies, that therefore we are meant to gather our doctrines from documents which do not profess to be doctrinal? Besides, when CHRIST told them to search the Scriptures for notices of Himself, He had vouchsafed already to present Himself before them: He was a living comment on those Scriptures to which He referred. What He was to be, was *not* understood before He appeared. The case is the same with Christian Doctrine now. The Creed confronts Scripture, and seems to say to us, ‘Search the Scriptures, for they testify of me.’ But if we attempt to gain the truth of Doctrine without the Creed, perchance we shall not be more successful in our search than were the Jews in seeking CHRIST before He came; yet under circumstances different from theirs, in which knowledge is necessary to salvation, and error is sin.”
—Newman *On Romanism, &c.* Lect. VI. pp. 195—200.

NOTE H, p. xxxviii.

“ The intermediate links between the highest Spiritualism of the Calvinist or Arminian, and the lowest Moralism of the Socinian, may easily be traced in almost any of the Christian doctrines; but let us confine ourselves to that all-important one which has already been dwelt on—the Atonement. The Spiritualist, no less than the Socinian, seems to wish to understand it, till at last he fancies that he is able. He calls it a ‘satisfying of the Justice of God,’ and complaisantly proceeds to arrange the Biblical system in conformity with this idea, which he will probably call ‘the leading doctrine’ of the Scriptures, or in one monopolizing phrase, ‘the Gospel.’ Now that the Atonement was indeed a satisfaction, is most true; but still this also is a mystery, and not any ‘explanation’ whatever. One who is a little more given to rationalize than such a man, and has learned this system, begins, in no long time, to suspect that there is, after all, nothing so evidently ‘rational’ in this notion of ‘satisfying justice’—so he eventually casts aside this, and considers the Atonement as a ‘manifestation of God’s hatred of sin.’—But a still closer thinker will speedily grow dissatisfied with this notion, so far at least as it pretends to be an ‘explanation;’ as it hardly seems ‘rational’ to impute to the DEITY so circuitous and cumbrous a method of inculcating so plain a truth; hence he begins seriously to question the possibility of rejecting the notion of the Atonement altogether!—And the steps from such a rejection to a rejection of the Bible, and all Religion, are neither many nor widely apart.”—Irons’s *Lectures on the Holy Catholic Church*, pp. 128, 129.

NOTE I, p. xxxviii.

The CONGREGATIONALISTS “believe that there is no minister and no church among them, that would deny the substance of any one of the following doctrines of Religion, though each might prefer to state his sentiments in his own way. . . . They believe that God is revealed in the Scripture, as the FATHER,

the SON, and the HOLY SPIRIT, and that to each are attributed the same Divine properties and perfections. . . . The doctrine of the Divine existence, as above stated, they cordially believe, without attempting fully to explain.”—*Declaration of the Faith, Church Order, and Discipline of the Congregational or Independent Dissenters, as adopted at the third General Meeting of the Congregational Union [!] of England and Wales, held at the Congregational Library, London, May 7th, 8th, and 10th, 1833.* Pp. 4, 5.

Will it be credited that the above quotation contains the *whole recorded belief* of the “Congregational Dissenters” of the nineteenth century, respecting the HOLY TRINITY? “They believe that GOD is revealed in Scripture AS the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY SPIRIT, and that to each *are attributed* the same Divine properties and perfections.” The “*substance*” of this statement “no minister and no church among them would DENY, *though each might prefer to state his* sentiments IN HIS OWN WAY!!” What Sabellian, or even Arian, would refuse assent to so vague a “declaration” as this?

NOTE K, p. xli.

See Acts ii. 46, which shows that the Eucharist was even *daily* celebrated in the Apostolic age; and Malachi i. 10, “From the rising of the sun, even unto the going down of the same, My Name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a *pure offering*.” Which sacrifice, says St. AUGUSTIN (De Civ. DEI, xviii. 35), “per sacerdotium CHRISTI secundum, ordinem Melchisedec in omni loco á solis ortu usque ad occasum DEO jam videmus offerri.” It is cheering to find the Catholic doctrine of a *Commemorative Sacrifice* in the Eucharist (which a few years since seemed well nigh forgotten) boldly proclaimed, from the University pulpit of our Alma Mater, by one of the most eloquent preachers of this or of any other age. “And if,” said Mr. Melvill, “we attach weight to the opinions of the Church in her best days, we must hold that there is actually a sacrifice in the

Eucharist, though of course not such as the Papists pretend. CHRIST is offered in the Sacrament, but only commemoratively. Yet the commemoration is not a bare remembering, or putting ourselves in mind; it is strictly a commemoration made to God the FATHER. As CHRIST, by presenting His death and satisfaction to His Father, continually intercedes for us in Heaven, so the Church on earth, when celebrating the Eucharist, approaches the throne of grace by representing CHRIST unto His Father in the holy mysteries of His death and passion."—*Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge*, February, 1837, by the Rev. Henry Melvill, B. D., late Fellow and Tutor of St. Peter's College, p. 7.

The same great truth has been proclaimed by the Bishop of Exeter, in his late celebrated Charge. Such was the doctrine of the Reformers and the Primitive Church (see post, p. 27, and the Appendix, pp. 251—268); and when it shall have become more generally revived among us, may we not hope that, among other and more important results, our Altars will cease to be concealed from the view of our congregations, and otherwise dishonoured, as at present they too often are.¹

The reader who is desirous of learning how far we Catholics differ in the doctrine of the Mass from our Romish brethren *in England*, may profitably consult their most popular Prayer Book.—Dr. Challoner's *Garden of the Soul*, pp. 64—68. Edit. 1824.

¹ See an earnest letter (signed M.) by my valued friend, Pelham Maitland, Esq. of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, in the *British Magazine* for October, 1837.

CONTENTS.

FORMULARIES.

HOMILY ON THE READING AND KNOWLEDGE OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

Sufficiency of holy Scripture, p. 1.

“CONCERNING THE SERVICE OF THE CHURCH” IN THE “BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.”

An appeal to Antiquity respecting the Liturgy, p. 2.

PREFACE TO THE ORDINATION SERVICE BOOK.

An appeal to Antiquity respecting the Priesthood, p. 2.

CONVOCATION OF A. D. 1571.

Sufficiency of holy Scripture. The test of its Canonicity. Of
the Authority of the Church, p. 2.—Of the traditions of the
Church. Of the Authority of General Councils, p. 3.

1 ELIZ. c. I. § 36. A. D. 1558.

Of the Authority of the *first four* General Councils, pp. 3, 4.

CONVOCATION OF A. D. 1640.

An example of the application of the above Rule, pp. 4, 5.

SERVICE FOR THE ORDERING OF PRIESTS.

Sufficiency of holy Scripture, p. 5.

CONVOCATION OF A. D. 1571.

The Catholic interpretation of holy Scripture to be followed, p. 5.

RULES FOR THE CONFERENCE WITH THE PRIESTS AND
JESUITS SENT DOWN FROM THE LORDS OF THE COUNCIL
TO THE BISHOPS, 1582.

Holy Scripture the Document of proof. The testimony of the
Fathers to be alleged in proof of this statement. The inter-
pretation of the primitive Doctors to be followed, pp. 6, 7.

CONVOCATION OF A. D. 1603.

An appeal to Antiquity respecting the cross at Baptism, pp. 7, 8.
Respecting the times of conferring Orders. Respecting the
Ordering of Deacons. Respecting decency of apparel in
the Clergy, p. 8.—Ministers, not allowed Preachers, may
not expound. A National Synod the Church Representative.
Synods conclude as well the absent as the present. Depravers
of the Synod censured, p. 9.

CONVOCATION OF A. D. 1640.

An appeal to Antiquity "concerning some rites and cere-
monies," pp. 9, 10.

THE COMMISSION FOR THE SAVOY CONFERENCE, A. D. 1661.

The Book of Common Prayer to be compared with the *most
ancient* Liturgies, p. 10.

THE EPISCOPALIAN COMMISSIONERS AT THE SAVOY
CONFERENCE, A. D. 1661.

Who are orthodox, pp. 10, 11.

DOCTORS OF THE CHURCH.

CRANMER, DOCTOR, ARCHBISHOP, AND MARTYR.

The Word of God, as taught by the Primitive Church, to
be believed, pp. 12, 13.—Of the Authority of the Church,

pp. 13, 14.—Which Church is to be followed, pp. 14, 15.—The unanimous interpretation of the Fathers infallible. A declaration of submission in all matters of Religion to the judgment of the Catholic Church, pp. 15, 16.

HOOPER, BISHOP AND MARTYR.

The sufficiency of holy Scripture, p. 16.

RIDLEY, DOCTOR, BISHOP AND MARTYR.

Of the true Church and Vincentius Lirinensis, pp. 16, 17.—Of the infallibility of General Councils, p. 17.

LATIMER, BISHOP AND MARTYR.

Of the infallibility of General Councils, p. 17.

CONFESSION OF FARRAR, HOOPER, COVERDALE, &c.

The holy Scriptures a Judge in all controversies of faith. The Catholic Church indefectible. A confession of faith, p. 18.

PHILPOT, DOCTOR AND MARTYR.

The holy Scriptures, as expounded by the Primitive Church, the judge of Controversies. The Catholic Church an indefectible interpreter of the Scripture. The Catholic Church a sure instructor in matters of Religion, pp. 19, 20.

JEWEL, BISHOP.

The sufficiency of holy Scripture, p. 20.—Apostolical Tradition, pp. 21, 22.—Of the ancient Fathers, pp. 22, 23.—The judgment of the primitive Fathers to be followed, pp. 23, 24.—The anti-catholicity of Romanism, pp. 24, 25.—The Anglican Church was reformed after the primitive model, pp. 25, 26.—A challenge to the Romanists, pp. 26—28.

SANDYS, ARCHBISHOP.

Scripture the foundation of the faith, pp. 28, 29.

HOOKE, PRIEST AND DOCTOR.

The sufficiency of Scripture unto the end for which it was instituted, pp. 29—32.

NOWEL, PRIEST AND DOCTOR.

Sufficiency of holy Scripture. The use of Councils, &c., p. 33.

WHITGIFT, ARCHBISHOP.

Sufficiency of holy Scripture, pp. 33, 34.—Change of the Sabbath. Councils and Fathers, p. 34.

BANCROFT, ARCHBISHOP.

The *via media* recommended, p. 34.—Private men are to submit their judgment to the determination of the Catholic Church, p. 35.

BILSON, BISHOP.

Of Synods, pp. 35—37.—What is Catholic, p. 37.

FIELD, PRIEST.

Of promises made unto the Church, how it is secured from error, and the different degrees of obedience we owe to it, pp. 37—40.—Of the rule of the Church's judgment in matters of faith, pp. 40—43.—What traditions are received by the Anglican Church, pp. 43, 44.—Of the rules whereby true traditions may be known from counterfeits, pp. 44, 45.—Of the interpretation of the Fathers, p. 45.

OVERALL, BISHOP.

Holy Scripture is to be interpreted by the consent of the Catholic Church, p. 45.

MASON, PRIEST.

Of decisive judgment in controversies of faith. Holy Scripture the test of Divine Truth, p. 46.—Of public and private judgment. St. Augustine's test of Tradition, p. 47.

ANDREWS, BISHOP AND DOCTOR.

Private interpretations of Scripture condemned, pp. 47—49.

DONNE, PRIEST.

An Apostolical Constitution is second only to holy Scripture in authority. The authority of the Catholic Church, pp. 49—51.

WHITE, BISHOP.

Of Scripture and Tradition, pp. 51, 52.

JACKSON, PRIEST AND DOCTOR.

That the title of Catholic is proper and essential to the faith professed by the Anglican Church, but cannot truly be attributed to the Creed of the Church of Rome, pp. 52—56.—The difference between the Anglican and Roman Churches concerning the rule of faith, p. 57.—True Ecclesiastical Tradition shown to be Apostolic and Divine, pp. 58—61.

MONTAGUE, BISHOP.

Unwritten traditions, p. 62.

CHILLINGWORTH, PRIEST.

A profession of faith. The Church of England at the Reformation did not separate from "Universality, Antiquity, and Consent," pp. 62, 63.

LAUD, DOCTOR, ARCHBISHOP, AND MARTYR.

That the Scripture, where it is plain, should guide the Church; and the Church, where there is doubt or difficulty, should expound the Scripture. On the sufficiency of Scripture, pp. 63, 64.—The interpretation of an universal Tradition never to be refused. The Anglican Church not a Judge in her own cause, pp. 64, 65.—That the baptism of infants may be concluded from Scripture, pp. 65—68.—The Catholic Church infallible in fundamentals, pp. 68—70.—Scripture and Tradition ought to go together, pp. 70, 71.—Of General Councils. General Councils when infallible, pp. 71, 72.

CHARLES, KING AND MARTYR.

Holy Scripture should be interpreted by the universal consent of Fathers, pp. 73, 74.

PRIDEAUX, BISHOP.

Of Tradition, p. 73.

HALL, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.

That the Anglican Church is Catholic in Doctrine, pp. 74, 75.

BIRCKBECK, PRIEST.

Of Scripture and Tradition, pp. 75, 76.

MORTON, BISHOP.

Of the Creeds and General Councils, pp. 76, 77.

HAMMOND, DOCTOR AND CONFESSOR.

The two ways of conveying the faith to us, pp. 77, 78.—The testimony upon which we receive the faith, pp. 78, 79.—The qualifications of such testimonies, pp. 79—82.—Where these qualifications may be found, pp. 82—84.—The Consent of Doctors. Definitions of Councils truly General, p. 83.—The benefit from General Councils, pp. 84, 85.—Reverence due to General Councils, and to the first four especially, pp. 85—87.—A true General Council is indefectible. The fifth General Council. Summary of the Judgment of the Anglican Church respecting Scripture and Tradition, pp. 87, 88.

HEYLIN, PRIEST AND CONFESSOR.

Of the authority of the Fathers, pp. 88—92.—Two ways of judging things obscure, according to Peter Martyr, p. 89.—What traditions are received by the Anglican Church, pp. 93, 94.—Of the holy Catholic Church, pp. 94, 95.—The Catholic Church indefectible, pp. 95, 96.—The Catholic Church the Interpreter of Scripture, pp. 96—98.

SANDERSON, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.

Tradition, pp. 98, 99.—The Catholic Church a Guide to the right understanding of Scripture, pp. 99—100.

BRAMHALL, ARCHBISHOP AND CONFESSOR.

The rule of faith, pp. 100, 101.—Tradition. Scripture the rule of supernatural truths, pp. 101, 102.—Who are the proper interpreters of Scripture, and how far, pp. 102, 103.—The manner of expounding Scripture, pp. 103, 104.—That this is conformable to the Doctrine and practice of our Church, pp. 104, 105.—The Anglican Church primitive in Doctrine. Who are Catholics, pp. 106, 107.

USHER, ARCHBISHOP.

Tradition. The Catholic Church indefectible in matters of faith, pp. 107—109.

TAYLOR, DOCTOR, BISHOP, AND CONFESSOR.

Tradition, pp. 109—112.—Of the Tradition of Scripture, pp. 112, 113.—Sufficiency of the Scriptures, pp. 113, 114.—The value of primitive Antiquity, pp. 114, 115.—The Doctrine of the Anglican Church, Primitive and Apostolic, pp. 115, 116.—The Apostles' Creed the rule of faith, pp. 116—118.—St. Vincent's rule, pp. 118, 119.—The Consent of the Catholic Church should be our measure of Doctrine, pp. 119, 120.

COSIN, BISHOP.

The Anglican Church has continued the *Old* Religion, pp. 120, 121.—The Catholic interpretation of Scripture received by the Church of England, p. 121.

THORNDIKE, PRIEST.

How the Tradition of the Church limits the interpretation of Scripture, pp. 121, 122.—The Catholic Church indefectible, p. 122.—How the declaration of the Church becomes a reasonable mark of heresy, p. 123.—That which is not found in the Scriptures may yet have been delivered by the Apostles, p. 124.—St. Augustine's test of Apostolical traditions, pp. 124, 125.—Of the Fathers of the Church, pp. 125—129.—Two sorts of means to resolve whatsoever is resolvable concerning the Scriptures, pp. 129—131.

BARROW, PRIEST AND DOCTOR.

Of the respect due to our spiritual Guides, pp. 131, 132.—Anti-Catholic Teachers not to be regarded. The Fathers most helpful interpreters of the Scriptures, pp. 132, 133.

ALLESTREE, PRIEST.

The sufficiency of Scripture, pp. 133, 134.—Explications of Scripture are much confirmed by the profession of the Catholic Church, p. 134.

SPARROW, BISHOP.

The authority of the Church, pp. 134—137.

PEARSON, BISHOP AND DOCTOR.

The Catholic Church has ever preserved the true faith, p. 138.

TILLOTSON, ARCHBISHOP.

Holy Scripture the only standard of faith, pp. 138, 139.— Catholic Tradition the best Interpreter of Scripture, pp. 139, 140.

STILLINGFLEET, BISHOP AND DOCTOR.

The sense of the Primitive Church the best Interpreter of Scripture, pp. 140, 141.—We believe nothing upon the *present* Church's *infallible authority*, but we submit in all things to the *Universal* Church's *testimony*, pp. 141—143.—That we would receive any doctrine in controversy between us and Rome upon as universal a tradition as that of the Scriptures. The Catholic Church indefectible in fundamentals. Of the authority of our spiritual Guides, pp. 143—147.—The Church of England is guided by the unanimous consent of the Primitive Fathers. St. Vincent's rule. The means which are sufficient to discover the sense of Scripture, pp. 147, 148.

KENN, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.

A confession of faith, p. 148.—The Catholic Church indefectible, and how far, p. 149.

KIDDER, BISHOP.

The judgment of Discretion, p. 149.

PATRICK, BISHOP.

Of the Church's infallibility, pp. 150, 151.—The sufficiency of Scripture declared by the Catholic Church. The degrees of spiritual authority, pp. 151, 152.—The authority of particular Churches. The Word of God to be received whether written or *unwritten*, pp. 152, 153.—What traditions the Anglican Church receives. I. The holy Scriptures. II. The tradition of the Scriptures. III. Apostolical traditions which are contained in the ancient Liturgies. IV. The Catholic Tradition

which determines the meaning of Scripture. V. Traditions confirmatory of Scripture—Infant Baptism—the Divine authority of Episcopacy. VI. Pious opinions universally believed, and not contrary to Scripture. VII. Traditions of the Church respecting matters of order, rites, &c. pp. 153—160.—Of the doctrinal opinions of particular Churches and Doctors, pp. 161, 162.—We reject traditions which contain “doctrines necessary to salvation” which are not revealed in holy Scripture, pp. 162, 163.—We receive nothing merely upon the credit of the Church of Rome. We cannot receive those doctrines which the Church of Rome now presses upon us upon account of traditions, pp. 163, 164.—No particular Church has authority to commend any thing as an Article of faith to posterity, which it hath not received, as such, from the Apostles, p. 164.—Of the Ecclesiastical Tradition contained in the confessions of particular Churches in these days. Oral Tradition most uncertain, pp. 165, 166.

SHERLOCK, PRIEST.

The faith of the Anglican Church is founded on Scripture and Apostolical Tradition, pp. 166, 167.—The universal consent of the Catholic Church is the best external testimony of the Christian faith. The use which the Church of England makes of the Church Catholic in the interpretation of holy Scripture, pp. 168—170.—The Fathers in the ancient Councils reasoned from Scripture and the sense of the Catholic Church, pp. 170—172.

BEVERIDGE, BISHOP AND DOCTOR.

The sufficiency of holy Scripture, pp. 172, 173.—The Catholic Church an indefectible Interpreter of Scripture, pp. 173, 174.—The temerity of the present age in matters of Religion, pp. 174, 175.—The inspiration of holy Scripture. Divers interpretations of holy Scripture.—The consent of the Catholic Church to be followed, pp. 176, 177.—The consent of the Catholic Church the surest interpretation of Scripture. The consequent necessity of consulting the Fathers, pp. 178, 179.—The consent of the Fathers must be *universal*. The Laity have never been permitted to judge in controversies, pp. 179—181.—An objection against the authority of the Fathers

answered, pp. 181—183.—The Anglican Church was reformed on the primitive model, p. 183.—Great regard to be had to the Primitive Church, pp. 183—185.

BULL, BISHOP AND DOCTOR.

That our Reformation was no Innovation, pp. 185—189.—The Anglican rule of faith, p. 189.

GRABE, PRIEST AND CONFESSOR.

Contempt of Tradition the cause of Schism, pp. 189, 190.—The form of the Eucharistic Consecration an Apostolic tradition, pp. 190, 191.

SHARPE, ARCHBISHOP.

The Anglican Church orthodox, in the sense of holy Scripture and the Fathers, pp. 191, 192.

TENISON, ARCHBISHOP.

Of the respect which the Anglican Church pays to the Church Universal, pp. 192—194.

HICKES, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.

The Anglican Church is guided by the Church Catholic, the Roman Church by the Council of Trent, pp. 194, 195.

SOUTH, PRIEST.

The abuse of Private Judgment condemned, pp. 195, 196.

LESLIE, PRIEST AND CONFESSOR.

The Consent of all ages and Churches gives us an infallible assurance of the faith, pp. 196, 197.

BINGHAM, PRIEST.

What are Fundamentals, pp. 197—200.—How different Churches maintained communion with one another. First, in faith; Secondly, in mutual assistance of each other for defence of the common faith, pp. 200, 201.

WHITBY, PRIEST.

We are bound to reject such doctrines as have been rejected by the Catholic Church, p. 202.

COLLIER, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.

Tradition. Infant Baptism, p. 201.—The change of the Sabbath. The Canonicity of the Old and New Testament. Catholic Tradition is recommended by holy Scripture, pp. 203, 204.—Remarks on 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17, pp. 204, 205.

JENKIN, PRIEST.

The rule of St. Vincent, p. 205.

WATERLAND, PRIEST AND DOCTOR.

Scripture and Antiquity, pp. 206, 207.—That a very particular regard is due to the *public acts* of the ancient Church, pp. 208—210.—A refutation of the charge that the VIth Article condemns the method of interpreting Scripture by Antiquity, pp. 210—212.—We produce not Fathers to superadd *new* doctrines to Scripture, but only to secure the *old*, pp. 212—214.

BRETT, PRIEST AND CONFESSOR.

The Canon de Concionatoribus. The rule which it lays down is infallible, pp. 214—216.—Catholic Tradition the only Guide to the knowledge of things necessary to salvation, pp. 216—219.—How we may be satisfied that we are not deceived in a tradition. And that the traditions of the Church which are found, elder than the Council of Nice, may be depended on, as derived from the Apostles, pp. 219—223.—The *Form of sound words* which St. Paul committed to Timothy, and was also committed to other Apostolical Bishops, was something to be delivered down to succeeding ages by Tradition, pp. 223—226.—We receive both Scripture and Tradition on the testimony of Antiquity, Universality, and Consent, pp. 226, 227.—As Christianity was at first taught by Tradition, so it has continued to be taught ever since: and every Christian has first been so instructed, pp. 227, 228.—Holy Scripture the test of Doctrine, pp. 228, 229.—If no regard be had to Tradition, it might be easy to

prove it necessary to wash one another's feet, pp. 229—231.—It is necessary for our right understanding our duty as Christians, that we join together Scripture and Tradition, pp. 231—233.—Of the *Deposit* committed by St. Paul to St. Timothy, pp. 234—237.

POTTER, ARCHBISHOP.

Modern liberality exposed and condemned, pp. 237—243.—That there is nothing “Popish” in the doctrine, that the Church has authority in matters of faith, pp. 243—248.

THE
JUDGMENT OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH,

&c. &c.

FORMULARIES.

UNTO a Christian man there can be nothing either more necessary or profitable than the knowledge of holy Scripture, forasmuch as in it is contained God's true word, setting forth His glory, and also man's duty. *And there is no truth nor doctrine necessary for our justification or everlasting salvation but that is (or may be) drawn out of that fountain and well of truth. . . .* Let us diligently search for the well of life, in the books of the New and Old Testament, and not run to the stinking puddles of *men's traditions, devised by man's imagination*¹ for our justification and salvation. For in holy Scripture is fully contained, what we ought to do or what to eschew, what to believe, what to love, and what to look for at God's hands at length.—Homily entitled “*A fruitful Exhortation to the Reading and Knowledge of Holy Scripture.*” Edit. 1587.

Sufficiency
of holy
Scripture.

There was never any thing, by the wit of man, so well devised, or so sure established, which in continuance of time hath not been corrupted: as among other things, it may plainly appear by the Common Prayers in the Church,

An appeal
to Antiquity.

¹ Mr. Newman, in his work on “Romanism and Popular Protestantism,” Lect. vii., has proved that *most*, if not all, the *Roman* traditions (“devised by man's imagination”) above referred to, originated in “the exercise of *Private Judgment* upon the text of Scripture *to the neglect of Catholic Tradition.*”

commonly called Divine Service. The first original and ground whereof, *if a man would search out by the ancient Fathers*, he shall find, that the same was not ordained, but of a good purpose, and for a great advancement of godliness. . . . Here you have an order of prayer, and for the reading of the Scripture, *much agreeable to the mind and purpose of the old Fathers*.—"Concerning the Service of the Church," in the "*Book of Common Prayer*."

An appeal to
Antiquity.

It is evident unto all men, diligently reading holy Scripture, *and ancient authors*, that from the Apostles' time, there hath been these Orders of Ministers in CHRIST'S Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.—*Preface to the Ordination Service Book*.¹

CONVOCATION OF A.D. 1571.

Sufficiency
of holy
Scripture.

Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation : so that [*i. e.* in such sense that] whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be *required* of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of holy Scripture, we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.—*Art. VI.*

The Test of
its Canoni-
city.

Of the au-
thority of
the Church.

The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and *authority in Controversies of Faith*: and yet it is not lawful *for the Church to ordain* any thing that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it *so expound* one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be *a witness and keeper of Holy Writ*, yet, as it ought not to *decree* any thing against the same,—so besides the same, ought it not

¹ Although the *first* object of the following pages will be to exhibit the "judgment of the Anglican Church," with regard to the value of Catholic Tradition in *matters of faith*; no opportunity of showing *the reverence entertained by our Church for Catholic antiquity* will be omitted.

to *enforce* any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation.—*Art. XX.*

It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly like; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, *so that nothing be ordained against GOD's Word.* Whosoever, *through his private judgment*, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, *which be not repugnant to the Word of GOD*, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that others may fear to do the like), as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the Magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren.

Of the Traditions of the Church.

Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying.—*Art. XXXIV.*

General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of Princes. And when they be gathered together, (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the SPIRIT and Word of GOD,) they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto GOD. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture.—*Art. XXI.*¹

Of the Authority of General Councils.

1 ELIZ. C. 1. § 36. A.D. 1558.

Provided always, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that such person or persons, to whom your Highness, your heirs, or successors, shall hereafter, by letters patent under the great seal of England, give

Of the Authority of the first four General Councils.

This article refers to (so called) General Councils *prior* to the general or universal reception of their decrees by the Holy Catholic Church.

authority to have, or to execute any jurisdiction, power, or authority spiritual, or to visit, reform, order, or correct any errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, or enormities, by virtue of this Act, shall not in any wise have authority or power to order, determine, or adjudge any matter or cause to be heresy, but only such as have heretofore been determined, ordered, or adjudged to be heresy, by the authority of the Canonical Scriptures, or *by the* FIRST FOUR GENERAL COUNCILS, or any of them, or by any other General Council, wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of the said Canonical Scriptures.¹—*Gibson's Codex*, Vol. I. p. 425. Fol. Oxford, 1713.—*Collier's Eccles. Hist.* II. p. 421.

CONVOCATION OF A.D. 1640.

An example
of the appli-
cation of the
above Rule.

Whereas much mischief is already done in the Church of GOD, by the spreading of the damnable and cursed heresy of Socinianism, as being a complication of many

¹ "In this Act, one particular deserves, and demands, very special attention; namely, the unqualified deference paid to the *first four* General Councils. The latest of these Councils sat and deliberated in the year 451. A point of time, therefore, is fixed, previously to which, the Church of England *unreservedly recognises the guidance of the Catholic Church, in the interpretation of Christian verities*. If it be objected, that this enactment has become obsolete, by the suppression of the high commission court, it may fairly be replied, that the Church of England, in ceasing publicly to denounce heresies, has not revoked her condemnation of them; but has merely confined herself to pure ecclesiastical censures: for the justification of which censures, she, of course, refers herself to the same rules, on which severer measures had been founded." BISHOP JEBB. "*Appendix*" to "*Sermons on subjects chiefly practical*," p. 360. Edit. 1824. A comparison of the above Act, with the Canon *de Concionatoribus* and the XXth Article, will show that in the Anglican view, the present Church is not "so much a judge of Scripture as a *witness* of Catholic Truth delivered to her in the first ages, whether by Councils, or by Fathers, or in whatever other way." "And if," says Mr. Newman, "she does not claim any gift of interpretation for herself, in the high points in question, much less does she allow individuals to pretend to it. Explicit as our Articles are in asserting that the doctrines of faith are contained and must be pointed out in Scripture, yet they give no hint that private persons may presume to search Scripture independently of external help, and to determine for themselves what is saving. The Church has a prior claim to do so, but even the Church asserts it not, but hands over the office to Catholic Antiquity. In what our Articles say of holy Scripture, as the document of proof, exclusive reference is had to *teaching*. It is not said that individuals are to infer the faith, but that the Church is to prove it

ancient heresies, *condemned by the four first General Councils*, and contrariant to the Articles of Religion now established in the Church of England. . . . It is therefore decreed, &c.—*Can. IV. Sparrow's Collection*, 4to. *Edit.* 1671.

The Bishop.—Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine, required of necessity for eternal salvation through faith in JESUS CHRIST? And are you determined with the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing (as required of necessity to eternal salvation), but that you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture?

Sufficiency
of holy
Scripture.

Answer.—I am so persuaded, and have so determined by God's grace.—*Service for the ordering of Priests.*

CONVOCATION OF A.D. 1571.

But chiefly they (Preachers) shall take heed that they teach nothing in their preaching, which they would have the people religiously to observe and believe, but that which is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old Testament and the New, and *that which the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have gathered out of that very doctrine.*¹—*Liber quorundam Canonum disciplinæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ. De Concionatoribus.*—*Sparrow's Collection*, p. 238.

The Catho-
lic interpre-
tation of
holy Scrip-
ture to be
followed.

from Scripture; not that individuals are to learn it, but are to be taught it. . . . The sole question, I say, in the Articles is *how the Church is to teach.* . . . In like manner, the Canon of 1571 is concerning the duty of *preachers*; the question whether individuals may exercise a right of private judgment on the text of Scripture *in matters of faith* is not even contemplated."—"Lectures on Romanism, &c." LECT. xi. pp. 323—325.

¹ Imprimis vero videbunt, ne quid unquam doceant pro concione, quod a populo religiose teneri et credi velint, nisi quod consentaneum sit doctrinæ veteris aut novi Testamenti, quodque ex illa ipsa doctrina Catholici Patres et veteres Episcopi collegerint.

The book of Canons which contains the above regulation is said to consist of "certayne articles of the holy ministrie, and of the offices of the Church, fully agreed upon by Matthew, Archbyshoppe of Caunterburie, Primate of all England, and Metropolitane, and all other Bishops of the same Province, which were partly present in person, and partly subscribed by the handes of their

RULES FOR THE CONFERENCE WITH THE PRIESTS AND
JESUITS SENT DOWN FROM THE LORDS OF THE COUN-
CIL TO THE BISHOPS, 1582.

Our opinion concerning the proceedings with the Jesuits and seminary Priests, and other Papists, by such as shall be appointed to have conference with them.

Holy Scrip-
ture the
document
of proof.

I. What matter soever they shall deal in with them, to set down such places of the holy Scripture, as they do ground their opinion upon. If they will not, or cannot, show any; to testify to the present auditory, that these men do build their faith and religion, not upon the Rock of the Holy Scriptures, *upon the which only faith is grounded*, but the uncertain sands of men's traditions. And then to allege *three or four pithy sentences* out of St. Chrysostom, Augustin, &c. that *all controversies are to be decided by the Scripture*, which if they refused, *they can claim NO SUCCESSION OF DOCTRINE from their Fathers*.

The testi-
mony of the
Fathers to
be alleged in
proof of the
above state-
ment.

The inter-
pretation of
the primi-
tive Doctors
to be fol-
lowed.

II. If they shall show any ground of Scripture, and wrest it to their sense, *let it be showed by the interpretation of the old Doctors, such as were before Gregory I.* For that in his time began the first claim of the Supremacy by the Patriarch of Constantinople: and shortly after was usurped by the Bishop of Rome, the first founder of the Papacy, and Supremacy of that See, by the authority of Phocas the traitor, and murderer of his lord.

III. And as for the testimony of the later Doctors, if they bring any, let him refuse them; for that the most part of the writers of that time and after, yielded to the authority of the Emperor and the Bishop of Rome.

Proctors, in a Synode begonne at London, in the Church of S. Paule, the thirde day of Aprill, 1571." "In the framing of this aforesaid book of Canons," says Strype, "the Archbishop (Parker), and the Bishops of Ely and Winton, had the main hand. But *all* the Bishops of *both* Provinces in Synod, in their own persons or by proxy, signed it: but not the lower house. And the Archbishop laboured to get the Queen's allowance to it, but had it not. She, often declining to give her license to their orders and constitutions, *reckoning that her Bishops' power and jurisdiction alone*, having their authority derived from her, *was sufficient*."—*Life of Archbishop Parker*. Fol. 1711, p. 322.

IV. If they can show no Doctor that agreed with them in their said opinion before that time, then to conclude that they have *no succession in that doctrine* from the time of the Apostles, and *above four hundred years after* (WHEN DOCTRINE AND RELIGION WERE MOST PURE), for that they can show no predecessor, whom they might succeed in the same. “Quod primum verum.” *Tertull.*—*Strype's Life of Archbishop Whitgift*, Fol. 1718, p. 98.

CONVOCATION OF A.D. 1603.

Following the steps of our most worthy King, because he therein followeth the rules of the Scriptures *and the practice of the primitive Church*, we do commend to all the true members of the Church of England these our directions and observations ensuing. . . . The honour and dignity of the name of the cross begat a reverend estimation even in the Apostles' times (for aught that is known to the contrary), of the sign of the cross, which the Christians shortly after used in all their actions. . . . The use of this sign in Baptism *was held by the primitive Church*, as well by the Greeks as the Latins, with one consent and great applause. . . . This continual and general use of the sign of the cross, is evident *by the testimonies of the ancient Fathers*. . . . It must be confessed that in process of time the sign of the cross was greatly abused in the Church of Rome. . . . But the abuse of a thing doth not take away the lawful use of it. Nay, so far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Churches, *in all things which they held and practised*, that, as the Apology of the Church of England confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies which do neither endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men: and *only departeth from them in those particular points*, wherein they were fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolical Churches, which were their first founders. . . . The sign of the cross in Baptism, being thus purged from all Popish superstition and error, and reduced in the Church

An appeal
to Antiqui-
ty respect-
ing the
cross at
Baptism.

of England to the primary institution of it, upon those rules of doctrine concerning things indifferent, which are consonant to the Word of God, *and the judgments of all the ancient Fathers*, we hold it the part of every private man, both Minister and other, reverently to retain the true use of it prescribed by public authority, &c.—*Can. XXX.*

An appeal
to Antiquity
respecting
the times of
conferring
orders.

Forasmuch as the ancient Fathers of the Church, led by the example of the Apostles, appointed Prayers and Fasts to be used at the solemn ordering of Ministers; and to that purpose allotted certain times, in which only Sacred Orders might be given or conferred: We, *following their holy and religious example*, do constitute and decree, that no Deacons or Ministers be made and ordered, but only on the Sundays immediately following *Jejunia quatuor temporum*, commonly called *Ember-weeks*, appointed in ancient time for Prayer and Fasting (purposely for this cause at their first institution), *and so continued* at this day in the Church of England.—*Can. XXXI.*

Ibid. Re-
specting the
ordering of
Deacons.

The office of Deacon being a step or degree to the Ministry, *according to the judgment of the ancient Fathers, and the practice of the primitive Church*; we do ordain and appoint, that hereafter no Bishops shall make any person, of what qualities or gifts soever, a Deacon and a Minister both together upon one day, &c.—*Can. XXXII.*

Ibid. Re-
specting
decency of
apparel in
the Clergy.

The true, *ancient*, and flourishing Churches of CHRIST being ever desirous that their Prelacy and Clergy might be had as well in outward reverence, as otherwise regarded for the worthiness of their ministry, did think it fit by a pre-script form of decent and comely apparel, to have them known to the people, and thereby to receive the honour and estimation due to the special Messengers and Ministers of Almighty God. We, therefore, *following their grave judgment*, and the ancient custom of the Church of England, and hoping that in time new-fangleness of apparel in some factious persons will die of itself, do constitute and appoint, &c.—*Can. LXXIV.*

No person whatsoever not examined and approved by the Bishop of the Diocese, or not licensed, as is aforesaid, for a sufficient or convenient Preacher, *shall take upon him to expound* in his own cure, or elsewhere, any Scripture or matter of doctrine, but shall only study to read plainly and aptly (*without glossing or adding*) the *Homilies* already set forth, or hereafter to be published by lawful authority, for the confirmation of the true faith, and for the good instruction and edification of the people.—*Can. XLIX.*

Ministers,
not allowed
Preachers,
may not
expound.

Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that the sacred Synod of this nation, in the name of CHRIST, and by the King's authority assembled, is not the true Church of England by representation; let him be excommunicated, &c.—*Can. CXXXIX.*

A National
Synod the
Church
Represent-
ative.

Whosoever shall affirm, that no manner of person, either of the Clergy or Laity, not being themselves particularly assembled in the said sacred Synod, are to be subject to the decrees thereof in causes ecclesiastical, (made and ratified by the King's Majesty's supreme authority,) as not having voices in them; let him be excommunicated, &c.—*Can. CXL.*

Synods con-
clude as well
the absent as
the present.

Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that the sacred Synod assembled as aforesaid, was a company of such persons as did conspire together against godly and religious professors of the Gospel: and that therefore both they and their proceedings in making of Canons and Constitutions in causes ecclesiastical by the King's authority, as aforesaid, ought to be despised and contemned, the same being ratified, confirmed, and enjoined, by the same regal power, supremacy and authority; let them be excommunicated, &c.—*Can. CXLI.*

Depravers
of the Synod
censured.

CONVOCAATION OF A.D. 1640.

We declare that this situation of the holy table (at the east end of the chancel) doth not imply that it is, or ought to be esteemed a true and proper altar, whereon CHRIST is

An appeal
to Antiquity
"concerning
some Rites
and Ceremo-
nies."

again *really* sacrificed: but it is, and may be called an altar by us, *in that sense in which the primitive Church called it an altar, and in no other . . .* Whereas the Church is the house of God, dedicated to His holy worship, and therefore ought to mind us, both of the greatness and goodness of His Divine Majesty, certain it is, that the acknowledgment thereof, not only inwardly in our hearts, but also outwardly with our bodies, must needs be pious in itself, profitable unto us, and edifying unto others. We therefore think it very meet and behoveful, and heartily commend it to all good and well-affected people, members of this Church, that they be ready to tender unto the LORD the said acknowledgment, by doing reverence and obeisance, both at their coming in and going out of the said churches, chancels, or chapels, *according to the most ancient custom of the primitive Church in the purest times.* —*Can. VII.*

THE COMMISSION FOR THE SAVOY CONFERENCE,
A.D. 1661.

The Book
of Common
Prayer to
be compared
with the
most ancient
Liturgies.

We therefore in accomplishment of our said will and intent, and of our continued and constant care and study for the peace and unity of the Churches within our dominions; and for the removal of all exceptions and differences, and the occasion of such differences and exceptions from among our good subjects; for or concerning the said Book of Common Prayer, or any thing therein contained, do by these our Letters Patents require, authorize, constitute, and appoint you the said, &c. to advise upon, and review the said Book of Common Prayer; comparing the same with *the most ancient Liturgies which have been used in the Church in the primitive and purest times.* —*Collier's Eccl. Hist. Vol. II. p. 877.*

THE EPISCOPALIAN COMMISSIONERS AT THE SAVOY
CONFERENCE, A.D. 1661.

Who are
orthodox.

To that part of the proposal that prayers may consist of nothing doubtful, or questioned by pious, learned, and *orthodox* persons; the Episcopal divines reply, that “since

it is not defined and ascertained *who* those orthodox persons are, they must either take all those for orthodox persons who have the assurance to affirm themselves such; and if so, the demand is unreasonable. For some who deny the Divinity of the SON of GOD, will style themselves orthodox, and yet there is no reason we should part with an article of our Creed for their satisfaction. Besides, the proposal requires an impossibility. For there never was, nor ever will be, any prayers couched in such a manner, as not to be questioned by some people who call themselves pious, learned, and orthodox. *But if by orthodox is meant only those who adhere to Scripture, and the Catholic Consent of Antiquity*, they are not of opinion that any part of the English Liturgy has been questioned by such.”—*Collier*, Vol. II. p. 880.¹

¹ The Editor thinks he cannot do better than append to the foregoing collection, the following quotation from the fourth admirable sermon of the Rev. W. F. Hook, preached before the University of Oxford: “But *other documents*,” he says, “it must be unnecessary to produce, in order to prove the deference for antiquity, which has ever since the Reformation been evinced by the Church in this country; for what indeed are our creeds, but the creeds unaltered of the primitive Church? What our articles and homilies but the mere application of ancient principles to modern controversies and practices, intended chiefly as a direction to those who want either means or ability to consult the original authorities? What is our Common Prayer Book itself, but a digest of the prayers that have been used in the Church universal from the remotest antiquity?” p. 98. The late lamented Bishop Jebb also observes with reference to our Liturgy, that “Regard for ancient faith and piety is manifest in every page, and almost every paragraph, of that incomparable work, derived, as it is, for the most part, from the actual forms, and accordant, as it is, in all parts, with the spirit and feeling of Christian antiquity. Nor was this derivation and accordance the mere growth of circumstances: it was the deliberate result of free choice, and discriminative wisdom. . . . The standard of our worship is, in truth, the standard of our faith. For, we may boldly challenge our adversaries, to produce any one article of our faith which is not contained in the formularies of our worship; or any one sentence in the formularies of our worship, which is not, in letter, or in spirit, contained in the writings of the ancient Church.”—*Practical Sermons. Appendix*, pp. 358, 359.

DOCTORS OF THE CHURCH.

CRANMER, DOCTOR, ARCHBISHOP, AND MARTYR.

B. 1489. D. 1556.

The Word
of God as
taught by
the primi-
tive Church
to be be-
lieved.

If all men without right or reason would give credit unto this Papist (Dr. Smith) and his Romish Church, against the most certain Word of GOD, and *the old holy and catholic Church of CHRIST*, the matter should be soon at an end, and out of all controversy. But forasmuch as the pure Word of GOD, and *the first Church of CHRIST from the beginning*, taught the true catholic faith, and Smith, with his Church of Rome, do now teach the clean contrary, the chaff cannot be tried out from the pure corn, (that is to say, the untruth discerned from the very truth,) without threshing, winnowing, and fanning, searching, debating, and reasoning.

As for me I ground my belief upon GOD's Word, (wherein can be no error,) *having also the consent of the primitive Church*, requiring no man to believe me further than I have GOD's Word for me. But these Papists speak at their pleasure what they list, and would be believed without GOD's Word, because they bear men in hand that they be the Church. The Church of CHRIST is not founded upon itself, but upon CHRIST and his Word, but the Papists build their Church upon themselves, devising new articles of faith from time to time, *without any Scripture*, and founding the same upon the Pope and his clergy, monks, and friars, and by that means they be both the makers and judges of their faith themselves. Wherefore this Papist, like a politic man, doth right wisely provide for himself and the Church, in the first entry of his book, that all men should leave searching for the truth, and stick hard and fast to the Church, *meaning himself and the Church of Rome*. For from the *true Catholic Church*, the Romish Church (which he accounteth catholic) hath varied and dissented many years past, as the

blindest that this day do live, may well see and perceive, if they will not purposely wink and shut their eyes.

Answer to Richard Smith concerning the "Catholic Doctrine of the Body and Blood of our SAVIOUR CHRIST." Fol. 1551. pp. 445, 446.

All the rest of his preface containeth nothing else but the authority of the Church, which (Smith saith) cannot wholly err: and he so setteth forth and extolleth the same, that he preferreth it above GOD'S Word, affirming not only that it is the pillar of truth and no less to be believed than holy Scripture, but also that we should not believe holy Scripture but for it. *So that he maketh the word of men equal or above the Word of GOD.* Of the Authority of the Church.

And truth it is, indeed, that the Church doth never wholly err, for ever, in most darkness, GOD shineth unto His elect, and in the midst of all iniquity, He governeth them so with His holy Word and SPIRIT, that the gates of hell prevail not against them. . . .

But this holy Church is so unknown to the world, that no man can discern it, but GOD alone, who only searcheth the hearts of all men, and knoweth his true children from other that be but bastards.

This Church is the pillar of the truth, because it resteth upon GOD'S Word, which is the true and sure foundation, and will not suffer it to err and fall. But as for the open known Church and the outward face thereof, it is not the pillar of truth, otherwise than that it is (as it were) a register or treasury to keep the books of GOD'S holy will and testament, and to rest only thereupon.

And as the register keepeth all men's wills, and yet hath none authority to add, change, or take away any thing, nor yet to expound the wills farther than the very words of the will extend unto (so that he hath no power over the will but by the will), even so hath the Church no further power over the holy Scripture (which containeth the will and testament of GOD), but only to keep it, and to see it observed and kept. For if the Church proceed further, to *make any new articles of faith, besides the Scripture, or*

contrary to the Scripture, or direct not the form of life according to the same, then it is not the pillar of truth, nor the Church of Christ, but the Synagogue of Sathan, and the Temple of Antichrist, which both erreth itself, and bringeth into error as many that do follow it.

And although the Papists have led innumerable people out of the right way, *yet the Church is to be followed*; but the Church of CHRIST, not of Antichrist, the Church that *concerning the faith containeth itself with GOD's Word*, not that deviseth daily new articles contrary to GOD's Word. The Church that by the true interpretation of Scripture, and good example, gathereth people unto CHRIST, not that by wresting of the Scripture and evil example of corrupt living, draweth them away from CHRIST. And now forasmuch as the wicked Church of Rome (counterfeiting the Church of CHRIST) hath, in this matter of the Sacrament of the blessed body and blood of our SAVIOUR CHRIST, varied from the pure and holy Church in the Apostles' time, *and many hundred years after*, it is easy to discern which church is to be followed. And I cannot but marvel that Smith allegeth for him Vincentius Lirinensis, who (contrary to Doctor Smith) teacheth plainly, that the Canon of the Bible is perfect and sufficient of itself for the truth of the catholic faith: and that the whole Church cannot make one article of faith, *although it may be taken as a NECESSARY WITNESS for the receiving and establishing of the same* with these three conditions, that the thing which we would establish thereby, hath been believed in *all places, ever, and of all men*, which the papistical doctrine in this matter hath not been.—*Ibid.* pp. 456—459.

Which
Church is to
be followed.

All these foolish and devilish superstitions the Papists, of their own idle brain, have devised of late years, which devices were never known in the old Church. And yet they cry out against them that profess the Gospel, and say that they dissent from the Church, and would have them to follow the example of *their* church. And so would they gladly do, if the Papists would follow *the first Church of the Apostles, which was most pure and uncorrupt*; but the

Papists have clearly varied from the usage and example of that church, and have invented new devices of their own brains, *and will in no wise consent to follow the primitive Church*; and yet they would have others to follow their church, utterly varying and dissenting from the *first most godly Church*. But, thanks be to the eternal God, the manner of the holy Communion, which is now set forth within this realm, is agreeable with the institution of CHRIST, with St. Paul, and *the old primitive and Apostolic Church*.—*Defence of the true and catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament, &c. Works, Oxf. 1833. Vol. II. pp. 462, 463.*

When all the Fathers agreed in the exposition of any place in Scripture, he acknowledged he looked on that as flowing from the SPIRIT of GOD; and it was a most dangerous thing to be wise in our own conceit: therefore, he thought Councils ought to found their decisions on the Word of GOD, and those expositions which had been agreed on by the Doctors of the Church.—*Speech on General Councils. Works, Vol. II. p. 14.*

The unanimous interpretation of the Fathers infallible.

Touching my doctrine of the Sacrament, and other my doctrine, of what kind soever it be, I protest that it was never my mind to write, speak, or understand any thing contrary to the most holy Word of GOD, *or else against the holy Catholic Church of CHRIST*, but purely and simply to imitate and teach those things only, which I had learned of the sacred Scripture, *and of the holy Catholic Church of CHRIST from the beginning, and also according to the exposition of the most holy and learned Fathers and Martyrs of the Church.*

A declaration of submission in all matters of Faith to the judgment of the Catholic Church.

And if any thing hath peradventure chanced otherwise than I thought, I may err: but heretic I cannot be, forasmuch as *I am ready in all things to follow the judgment of the most sacred Word of GOD, and of the holy Catholic Church*, desiring none other thing, than meekly and gently to be taught, if anywhere (which GOD forbid) I have swerved from the truth.

And I profess and openly confess, that in all my doctrine

and preaching, both of the Sacrament, and of other my doctrine whatsoever it be, not only *I mean and judge those things, as the Catholic Church and the most holy Fathers of old with one accord have meant and judged*, but also I would gladly use the same words that they used, and not use any other words, but to set my hand to all and singular their speeches, phrases, ways, and forms of speech, which they do use in their treatises upon the Sacrament, *and to keep still their interpretation*. But in this thing I only am accused for a heretic, because I allow not the doctrine lately brought in, of the Sacrament, and because I consent not to words not accustomed in Scripture and unknown to the ancient Fathers, but newly invented and brought in by men, and belonging to the destruction of souls, and overthrow of the old and pure religion.—*Appeal from the Pope, to the next General Council. Works, Vol. IV. pp. 126, 127.*

HOOPER, BISHOP AND MARTYR.

D. 1555.

The sufficiency of holy Scripture.

I believe that the Word of GOD (contained within the canonical books of the Old and New Testament) is of a far greater authority than the Church, the which word only doth sufficiently show and teach us all those things that in anywise concern our salvation, both what we ought to do, and what to leave undone. The same Word of GOD is the true pattern and perfect rule, after the which all faithful people ought to govern and order their lives, without turning either to the right hand or to the left hand, without changing any thing thereof, without putting to it, or taking from it, knowing that all the works of GOD are perfect, but most chiefly His Word.—*Articles upon the Creed. Art. LIV. Edit. 1583.*

RIDLEY, DOCTOR, BISHOP AND MARTYR.

B. 1500. D. 1555.

Of the true Church, and Vincentius Lirinensis.

I acknowledge an unspotted Church of CHRIST, in the which no man can err, without which no man can be saved, which is spread throughout all the world, that is, the

congregation of the faithful; neither do I alligate or bind the same to any one place. but confess the same to be spread throughout all the world; and where CHRIST's Sacraments are *duly* administered, His Gospel truly preached and followed, there doth CHRIST's candle shine as a city upon a hill, and as a candle in the candlestick. And in that the Church of GOD is in doubt, I use herein the wise counsel of Vincentius Lirinensis, whom I am sure you will allow, who, giving precepts how the Catholic Church may be in all schisms and heresies known, writeth in this manner: "When," saith he, "one part is corrupted with heresies, then prefer the whole world before that one part; but if the greatest part be infected, then prefer antiquity." In like sort now, when I perceive the greatest part of Christianity to be infected with the poison of the see of Rome, *I repair to the usage of the primitive Church.*—See *Life, by Gloucester Ridley*, 4to. 1763, pp. 613, 614.

Of the Universal Church, which is mingled of good and bad, thus I think. Whensoever they which be chief in it, which rule and govern the same, and to whom the rest of the whole mystical body of CHRIST doth obey, are the lively members of CHRIST, and walk after the guiding and rule of His Word, and go before the flock towards everlasting life; *then* undoubtedly Councils gathered together of such guides and pastors of the Christian flock, do indeed represent the Universal Church; and being so gathered in the name of CHRIST, they have a promise of the gift and guiding of His SPIRIT into all truth.

Of the infallibility of General Councils.

LATIMER, BISHOP AND MARTYR.

B. 1470. D. 1555.

As touching General Councils, at this present I have no more to say than you have said.—“*Certain godly, learned, and comfortable Conferences*” between *Dr. Nicholas Ridley and M. Hugh Latimer*. Edit. 1556, p. 23.

Ibid.

A CONFESSION OF

FARRAR, Bishop and Martyr,
HOOPER, Bishop and Martyr,
COVERDALE, Bishop and Con-
fessor,

ROWLAND TAYLOR, Doctor and
Martyr,
PHILPOT, Doctor and Martyr,
BRADFORD, Martyr,

MADE AT OXFORD, MAY 8, 1554.

The Holy
Scriptures a
Judge in all
controversies of Faith.

First.—We confess and believe all the Canonical Books of the Old Testament, and all the Books of the New Testament, to be the very true Word of God, and to be written by the inspiration of the HOLY GHOST, and are, therefore, to be heard accordingly, as the judge in all controversies and matters of religion.

The Catho-
lic Church
indefectible.

Secondly.—We confess and believe, that the Catholic Church, which is the spouse of CHRIST, as a most obedient and loving wife, doth embrace and follow the doctrine of these Books in all matters of religion, and, therefore, that she is to be heard accordingly: so that those who will not hear this Church, thus following and obeying the word of her husband, we account as heretics and schismatics, according to this saying: *If he will not hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen.*

A Confes-
sion of
Faith.

Thirdly.—We believe and confess all the articles of faith and doctrine set forth in the symbol of the Apostles, which we commonly call the Creed, and in the symbols of the Council of Nice, kept A.D. 324; of Constantinople, A.D. 384; of Ephesus, kept A.D. 432; of Chalcedon, kept A.D. 454; of Toletum, the first and fourth. Also in the symbols of Athanasius, Irenæus, Tertullian, and of Damasus, which was about the year of our Lord 376. We confess and believe (we say) the doctrine of the symbols generally, and particularly; so that whosoever doth otherwise, we hold the same to err from the truth.

And we doubt not, by God's grace, but we shall be able to prove all our confession here, to be most true *by the verity of God's Word, and consent of the Catholic Church.*—*Life of Ridley, by Gloucester Ridley, LL.B., pp. 525—528.*

PHILPOT, DOCTOR AND MARTYR.

D. 1555.

Bp. of Gloucester.—I pray you, by whom will you be judged in matters of controversy which happen daily?

Philpot.—By the Word of God, for CHRIST saith in St. John, the word that he spake shall be judge in the latter day.

The Holy Scriptures, as expounded by the primitive Church, THE judge of controversies.

Glouc.—What if you take the word one way, and I in another way, who shall be judge then?

Phil.—*The primitive Church.*

Philpot's Fourth Examination.

Phil.—I do not think that the Catholic Church can err in doctrine; but I require to prove the Church of Rome to be this Catholic Church.

The Catholic Church an infallible interpreter of the Scripture.

Storie.—Wilt thou not allow the interpretation of the Church upon the Scripture?

Phil.—Yes, if it be according to the word of the true Church; and this I say to you, as I have said heretofore, that if ye can prove the Church of Rome (whereof ye are) to be the true Catholic Church, which I ought to follow, I will be as ready to yield thereto (as long as it can be so proved) as you may desire me.—*Fifth Examination.*—*The Examination of the constant Martyr of CHRIST, John Philpot, Archdeacon of Winchester, at sundry seasons in the time of his sore imprisonment, &c. Edit. 1555.*

As many as abode in the ark of Noe were not drowned by the flood of Noe, even so many as abide in the true Church of CHRIST shall receive no hurt by all the blustering and corrupt waters which the dragon, which persecuteth the Church into the wilderness doth in the Apocalypse, cast out after her to the end to drown her therewith. You that stand in doubt of any thing by these new found heretics, run to the pure Catholic Church for your sure instructions. For as an ancient Father, St. Cyprian, saith: He that hath not the Church for his mother, hath not God for his

The Catholic Church a sure instructor in matters of Faith.

father. We have but one mother, saith Solomon in his Ballets (Cant. v.), and she coveteth to gather us under her wings, like a loving hen her chickens; *and if we abide there*, we are assured from all the ravening vermin of heretics, and though there shall fall on every side of thee millions, yet shall they not approach near unto thee. But if, after curiosity, thou go out astray, some kite or other will snatch thee up to the prince of the air, from whence thy fall will be great. If thou wilt be assured of the eternal kingdom of God, be stable in thy faith, *flee from sects and heresies*, and abide in the unity of CHRIST's spouse, His true Church. —“*An Apology of John Philpot, written for spitting upon an Arian,*” &c.

JEWEL, BISHOP.

B. 1522. D. 1571.

The sufficiency of holy Scripture.

We receive and embrace all the Canonical Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament; and we give our gracious God most hearty thanks, that He hath set up this light for us, which we ever fix our eyes upon, lest by human fraud, or the snares of the devil, we should be seduced to errors or fables; we own them to be the heavenly voices by which God hath revealed and made known His will to us; in them only can the mind of man acquiesce; in them all that is necessary for our salvation is abundantly and plainly contained, as Origen, St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom, and St. Cyril, have taught us. They are the very might and power of God unto salvation; they are the foundations of the Apostles and Prophets, upon which the Church of God is built; they are the most certain and infallible rule by which the Church may be reduced, if she happen to stagger, slip, or err; by which all ecclesiastical doctrines ought to be tried. No law, no *tradition*, no custom, is to be received or continued, if it be *contrary to Scripture*; no, though St. Paul himself, or an angel from heaven, should come and teach otherwise. (Gal. i. 8.)—*Apology of the Church of England*, c. ii. § 10.

This is the simplicity and plainness of M. Harding's

dealing. He telleth us many tales of the Apostles' tradi-^{Apostolical tradition.}tions, being himself the manifest despiser and breaker of the same traditions. Touching the words of St. Paul (2 Thess. ii.), I marvel that M. Harding could so easily be deceived. For St. Paul himself, even in the same words, and in the selfsame line, would have told him that by the name of traditions, he meant not *unwritten verities and lifeless ceremonies*, as he supposeth, *but the selfsame substance of religion and doctrine* that he uttered to the Thessalonians before, either by epistle or by preaching.

These be his words: "Hold the traditions which ye have received, either by epistle or by word." He calleth them *traditions*, although they were *contained in his Epistles*, and declared to them by writing. For the Apostle's preaching and writing in ground and substance were all one.—*Defence of the Apology.* Part II.

I grant, at the first preaching and publishing of the Gospel, ^{Ibid.} certain barbarous nations that received the faith of CHRIST had neither books nor letters; yet were they not therefore ignorant, or left at large to believe they knew not what. They had then certain officers in the Church, which were called *Catechistæ*, whose duty was, continually and at all times, to teach the principles of the faith, not by book, but by mouth. Of these mention is made in the Acts of the Apostles, in the Council of Nice, and elsewhere. This office bare Origen, that ancient learned Father. This doctrine Dionysius calleth *θεοπαράδοτα λόγια*, "Oracles, or instructions given from GOD;" and saith, "they passed from one to another, not by writing but by mouth," *ἐκ νοός εἰς νοῦν*, "from mind to mind." Neither did these traditions contain any secret or privy instructions, or inventions of men, as it is imagined by some, *but the very selfsame doctrine that was contained written in the Scriptures of GOD.* And, in this sort, the Gospel itself and the whole religion of CHRIST was called a tradition. So Tertullian (*De præ. adv. Hæret.*) calleth the articles of the faith, "an old tradition." So the faith of the HOLY TRINITY in the Council of Constantinople (Concil. Const. 6) is called "a tradition;"

and the faith of two sundry natures in CHRIST, in the same Council, is called *Apostolorum viva traditio*, "the lively tradition of the Apostles" (Act iv. eadem Actione). So it is written in Socrates (lib. ii. cap. 7), *Credimus in unum Deum Patrem, secundum Evangelicam et Apostolicam traditionem*: "We believe in one GOD the Father, according to the tradition of the Gospel and of the Apostles." So St. Basil (Basil. de Spiritu Sancto) calleth it "a tradition to believe in the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY GHOST." Therefore St. Paul saith: *Tenete traditiones, quas accepistis, sive per sermonem, sive per epistolam*, "Keep the traditions that ye have received, either by mouth or else by letter." By these words, the doctrine of the Apostles is called a tradition. And for this cause St. Cyprian (Cyp. ad Pompeium) saith: *Unde est ista traditio? an de Dominica, et Evangelica veritate descendens, an de Apostolorum mandatis, atque literis veniens?* "From whence is this tradition? whether cometh it from our Lord and from His Gospel, or else from epistles and commandments of the Apostles."—*Reply to Harding's "Answer to the Defence."* Art. XV.

Of the
ancient
Fathers.

Here, M. Harding, ye have taken in hand a needless labour. You know right well, we despise not the authority of the holy Fathers. . . . Throughout the whole discourse of this Apology in defence of the Catholic truth of our religion, next unto GOD's holy Word, we have used no proof or authority so much, as the expositions and judgments of the holy Fathers. We despise them not, therefore, but rather give GOD thanks, in their behalf, for that it hath pleased Him to provide so worthy instruments for His Church; and therefore do we justly reprove you, for that so unadvisedly and without cause, ye have forsaken the steps of so holy Fathers. The four General Councils, wherein ye dwell so long, as they make nothing against us, so in sundry points they fight expressly against you. . . . To come near the matter, we say not that all cases of doubt are, by manifest and open words, plainly expressed in the Scriptures. For so there would need no exposition. But

we say, that there is no case in religion so dark and doubtful, but that it may necessarily be either proved or reproved by collation and conference of Scriptures. . . . In this conference and judgment of the holy Scriptures, we need oftentimes the discretion and wisdom of learned Fathers. Yet notwithstanding may we not give them herein greater credit than is convenient, or than they themselves, if it were offered, would receive? We may reverently say of them, as Seneca, in the like case, sometimes said, “Non sunt Domini, sed Duces nostri.” They are our Leaders, but not our Lords. They are not the truth of God itself, but only witnesses of the truth. . . . But the bishops in those Councils, saith M. Harding, brought forth and followed the expositions of the learned ancient Fathers. And wherefore might they not? What man ever taught or said to the contrary? Yet notwithstanding they alleged them, not as the foundations or grounds, but only as approved and faithful witnesses of the truth. . . . In like sort do we also, this day, allege against you, the manifest and undoubted and agreeable judgments of the most ancient learned holy Fathers; and thereby, as by approved and faithful witnesses, we disclose the infinite follies and errors of your doctrine.—*Defence of the Apology*. Part I. c. ix. div. 1.

Fain would M. Harding have his reader to believe that ^{Ibid.} we utterly despise all holy Fathers; but we despise them not, M. Harding, as may partly appear by what we have already said. We read their works, we reverence them, we give God thanks for them; we call them the pillars, the lights, the Fathers of God's Church, we despise them not. This thing only we say: were their learning and holiness never so great, yet be they not equal in credit with the Scriptures of God.—*Ibid.* div. 3.

We never despised the judgment of the learned and holy Fathers, but rather take them and embrace them as the witnesses of God's truth. And herein we find you the more blameworthy, M. Harding, for that, having without cause renounced the judgment and orders of the primitive Church

The judgment of the primitive Fathers to be followed.

and ancient Fathers, as to the wise and learned it may appear, yet evermore ye make vaunt of your antiquity, and fray the world with a vizard of the Church, and a show of old Fathers, as if a poor summoner, that had lost his commission, would serve citations by the virtue of his empty box. And thus have ye set all *your vain phantasies in place of God's Church*, and *your Church in place of God*.—*Ibid.* Part VI. c. i. div. 2.

The judgment of the primitive Fathers to be followed.

These be cases, not of wit, but of faith; not of eloquence, but of truth; not invented or devised by us, but from the Apostles, and holy Fathers, and founders of the Church, by long succession brought unto us. We are not the devisers thereof, but only the keepers; not the masters, but the scholars. . . . Touching the substance of religion, we believe that the ancient, Catholic, learned Fathers believed; we do that they did, we say that they said. And marvel not, in what side soever ye see them, if you see us join unto the same. It is our great comfort, that we see their faith and our faith to agree in one.—*Reply.—Answer to M. Harding's conclusion, ad fin.*

The anti-catholicity of Romanism.

Well, then, let them at least show this their boasted antiquity; let them make it appear, that what they so much extol, is indeed of so vast an extent; let them prove, that all Christian nations have embraced their religion. But, alas! (as I said before,) they flee from their own decrees, and have already plucked up those Canons, which, but a very few years since, they made to last for ever. Why, then, should we trust them in relation to what they pretend concerning the Fathers, the ancient Councils, and the Scriptures? They have not, O good God! they have not on their sides what they pretend to have; they have neither *antiquity*, *universality*, nor *consent*, of either all times or all nations; and of this they are not ignorant themselves, though they craftily dissemble their knowledge; yea, at times, they will not obscurely confess it, and therefore sometimes they will allege, that the sanctions of *the ancient Councils and Fathers* are such as may lawfully be changed; “for different decrees (say they) will best suit the different state

of the Church in different times." And so they hide themselves under the name of the *Church*, and by a wretched sham, delude mankind.—*Apology*, c. v. § 8.

We (the Anglican Church) have done nothing in the changing of religion, either insolently or rashly; nothing but with great deliberation and slowly; nor had we ever thought of doing it, except the will of God undoubtedly and manifestly opened to us in the most sacred Scriptures, and the necessity of our salvation, had compelled us so to do; for although we have departed from that Church, which *they* call the Catholic Church, and thereupon they have kindled a great envy against us, in them who cannot well judge of us; yet it is enough for us, and ought to be so to any prudent and pious man, who considers seriously of his salvation, that we have only departed from that Church which may err, which CHRIST, who cannot err, so long since foretold should err, and which we see clearly with our eyes has departed from the holy Fathers, the Apostles, CHRIST Himself, and the primitive and Catholic Church. And we have approached, as much as possibly we could, the Church of the Apostles, and ancient Catholic Bishops and Fathers, which we know was yet a perfect, and, as Tertullian saith, *an unspotted virgin*, and not contaminated with any idolatry or great and public error. Neither have we only reformed the doctrine of our Church, and made it like theirs in all things, but we have also brought the celebration of the sacraments, and the forms of our public rites and prayers, to an exact resemblance to their institutions and customs. And so we have only done that which we know CHRIST Himself and all pious and godly men have in all ages ever done; for we have brought back Religion, which was foully neglected and depraved by them, to her original and first state; for we considered that the reformation of religion was to be made by that which was the first pattern of it; for this rule will ever hold good against all heretics, saith the most ancient Father Tertullian, *That that is true which is first, and that is adulterated and corrupted which is later.* Irenæus doth often appeal to the

The Anglican Church was reformed after the primitive model.

most ancient Churches who are nearest to CHRIST, and which therefore were not at all likely to have erred. And why is not that course now taken also? Why do we not return to a conformity with the most ancient churches? Why cannot that be now heard among us, which was pronounced in the Council of Nice, without the least contradiction or opposition from so many Bishops and Catholic Fathers; ἔθῃ ἀρχαῖα κρατεῖτω, *Let the old customs stand firm?*—*Apology*, c. vi. § 15.

A challenge
to the
Romanists.

If any learned man of all our adversaries, or if all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholic Doctor or Father: or out of any old General Council: or out of the holy Scriptures of GOD: or any one example of the primitive Church, whereby it may be clearly and plainly proved, that there was any private mass in the whole world at that time, for the space of six hundred years after CHRIST: or that there was any communion ministered unto the people under one kind: or that the people had their common prayers then in a strange tongue that they understood not: or that the Bishop of Rome was then called an universal Bishop, or the head of the Universal Church: or that the people was then taught to believe that CHRIST's body is really [*i.e. carnally,*] substantially, corporally, carnally or naturally in the Sacrament: or that His body is or may be in a thousand places or more at one time: or that the priest did then hold up the Sacrament over his head: or that the people did then fall down and worship it with godly honour: or that the Sacrament was then, or now ought to be, hanged up under a canopy: or that in the Sacrament, after the words of consecration there remaineth only the accidents of and shews, without the substance of bread and wine: or that the priest then divided the Sacrament in three parts, and afterward received himself all alone: or that whosoever had said the Sacrament is a figure, a pledge, a token, or a remembrance of CHRIST's body, had therefore been judged for an heretic: or that it was lawful then to have thirty, twenty, fifteen, ten or five masses said in the church,

in one day: or that images were then set up in the churches, to the intent the people might worship them: or that the lay-people was then forbidden to read the word of God in their own tongue.

If any man alive were able to prove any of these articles, by any one clear or plain clause, or sentence, either of the Scriptures; or of the old Doctors; or of any old General Council; or by any example of the primitive Church: I promised then that I would give over and subscribe unto him.

These words are the very like I remember I spake here openly before you all. And these be the things that some men say I have spoken and cannot justify. But I, for my part, will not only not call in any thing that I then said (being well assured of the truth therein), but also will lay more matter to the same. That if they that seek occasion, have any thing to the contrary, they may have the larger scope to reply against me. Wherefore, beside all that I have said already, I will say further, and yet nothing so much as might be said. If any one of all our adversaries be able dearly and plainly to prove by such authority of the Scriptures, the old Doctors, and Councils, as I said before, that it was then lawful for the priest to pronounce the words of consecration closely and in silence to himself: or that the priest had then authority to offer up CHRIST unto His Father:¹ or, to communicate and receive the Sacrament for another, as they do: or to apply the virtue of CHRIST's death and passion to any man by the mean of the Mass: or that it was then thought a sound doctrine to

¹ Bishop Jewel does not here deny the Catholic doctrine of a *Commemorative* Sacrifice in the Eucharist, for in his Reply to Harding, Lond. 1609, p. 424, he cites Chrysostom, in Epist. ad Hebræos Homil. xvii. who says, "We offer indeed, but in remembrance of His death. This sacrifice is an example of that sacrifice. This that we do, is done in remembrance of that that was done. We offer up the same that CHRIST offered, or rather, we work the remembrance of that sacrifice:" and then Jewel adds, "Thus we offer up CHRIST, that is to say, an example, a commemoration, a remembrance of the death of CHRIST. *This kind of sacrifice was never denied.*" Herein the Bishop agrees with Cranmer, Andrews, Laud, Bramhall, Taylor, Mede, Mason, and our other elder Divines, and every ancient liturgy extant—when shall the prayer of oblation be restored to our own service!

teach the people, that the Mass *ex opere operato*, that is, even for that it is said and done, is able to remove any part of our sin: or that then any Christian man called the Sacrament his LORD and GOD: or that the people was then taught to believe that the body of CHRIST remaineth in the Sacrament as long as the accidents of the bread remain there without corruption: or that a mouse, or any other worm or beast, may eat the body of CHRIST: (for so some of our adversaries have said and taught) or that when CHRIST said, “Hoc est corpus meum,” this word, *Hoc*, pointeth not the bread, but *Individuum vagum*, as some of them say: or that the accidents, or forms, or shews, or bread and wine, be the sacraments of CHRIST’s body and blood, and not rather the very bread and wine itself: or that the Sacrament is a sign or token of the body of CHRIST which lieth hidden underneath it: or that ignorance is the mother and cause of true devotion and obedience: these be the highest mysteries and greatest keys of their religion, and without them their doctrine can never be maintained or stand upright. If any one of all our adversaries be able to avouch any one of all these articles, by any such sufficient authority of Scriptures, Doctors, or Councils, as I have required, as I said before, so say I now again, I am content to yield unto him and to subscribe. But I am well assured that they never shall be able truly to allege one sentence. And because I know it, therefore I speak it, lest ye haply should be deceived.—*Sermon on 1 Cor. xi. 23, preached at Paul’s Cross, on the second Sunday before Easter, 1560.*

SANDYS, ARCHBISHOP.

B. 1519. D. 1588.

Scripture
the founda-
tion of the
Faith.

First, we disagree in the very foundation. They (the Romanists) lay one ground, and we, another. We lay no one stone but upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, whereupon whoever is builded, groweth into an holy temple in the LORD; a temple which no wind, no waves, no storm, no tempest, is able to overthrow. The foundation of our religion is the written Word, the Scriptures of God, the undoubted records of the HOLY GHOST.

We require no credit to be given to any part or parcel of our doctrine, further than the same may be clearly and manifestly proved by the plain words of the law of God, which remaineth in writing to be seen, read, and examined of all men. This we do, first, because we know that God hath caused His whole law to be written: secondly, because we see that it hath been the practice of all the defenders of the truth since the beginning, to rely their faith only upon the Scripture and written word: thirdly, because it is evident and plain that we cannot receive any other foundation of heavenly truth, without the overthrow of Christian faith.—*Sermon on Isaiah lv. 1—3.*—*Sermons*, 4to. 1616.

HOOKER, PRIEST AND DOCTOR.

B. 1554. D. 1600.

Although the Scripture of God therefore be stored with infinite variety of matter of all kinds, although it abound with all sorts of laws, yet the principal intent of Scripture is to deliver the laws of duties supernatural. Oftentimes it hath been in very solemn manner disputed, whether all things necessary unto salvation be necessarily set down in the holy Scriptures or no. If we define that necessary unto salvation, whereby the way to salvation is in any sort made more plain, apparent, and easy to be known; then is there no part of true philosophy, no art of account, no kind of science rightly so called, but the Scripture must contain it. If only those things be necessary, as surely none else are, without the knowledge and practice whereof it is not the will and pleasure of God to make any ordinary grant of salvation; it may be notwithstanding, and oftentimes hath been demanded, how the Books of holy Scripture contain in them all necessary things, when of things necessary the very chiefest is to know what Books we are bound to esteem holy; which point is confessed impossible for the Scripture itself to teach. Whereunto we may answer with truth, that there is not in the world any art or science, which proposing unto itself an end (as every one doth some end or other), hath been therefore thought defective, if it have not

The sufficiency of Scripture unto the end for which it was instituted.

delivered simply whatsoever is needful to the same end ; but all kinds of knowledge have their certain bounds and limits ; each of them presupposeth many necessary things learned in other sciences and known beforehand. . . . In like sort, albeit Scripture do profess to contain in it all things necessary unto salvation ; yet the meaning cannot be simply of all things which are necessary, but all things that are necessary in some certain kind or form ; as all things which are necessary, and either could not all, or could not easily be known by the light of natural discourse ; all things which are necessary to be known that we may be saved ; but known with presupposal of knowledge concerning certain principles whereof it receiveth as already persuaded, and then instructeth us in all the residue that are necessary. In the number of these principles one is the sacred authority of Scripture. Being therefore persuaded by other means that these Scriptures are the oracles of God, themselves do then teach us the rest, and lay before us all the duties which God requireth at our hands as necessary unto salvation. Further, there hath been some doubt likewise, whether *containing in Scripture* do import express setting down in plain terms, or else *comprehending* in such sort that by reason we may thence conclude all things which are necessary. Against the former of these two constructions, instance hath sundry ways been given. For our belief in the TRINITY, the co-eternity of the SON of God with His FATHER, the proceeding of the SPIRIT from the FATHER and the SON, the duty of baptizing infants : these with such other principal points, the necessity whereof is by none denied, are notwithstanding in Scripture nowhere to be found by express literal mention, only deduced they are out of Scripture by collection. This kind of comprehension in Scripture being therefore received, still there is no doubt, how far we are to proceed by collection, before the full and complete measure of things necessary be made up. For let us not think that as long as the world doth endure, the wit of man shall be able to sound the bottom of that which may be concluded out of the Scripture ; especially if “ things

contained by collection" do so far extend, as to draw in whatsoever may be at any time out of Scripture but probably and conjecturally surmised. But let *necessary* collection be made *requisite*, and we may boldly deny, that of all those things which at this day are with so great necessity urged upon this church, under the name of reformed church discipline, there is any one which their books hitherto have made manifest to be contained in the Scripture. Let them, if they can, allege but one properly belonging to their cause, and not common to them and us, and show the deduction thereof out of Scripture to be necessary. It hath been already showed how all things necessary unto salvation, in such sort as before we have maintained, must needs be possible for men to know; and that many things are in such sort necessary, the knowledge whereof is by the light of Nature impossible to be attained. Whereupon it followeth, that either all flesh is excluded from possibility of salvation, which to think were most barbarous, or else that God hath by supernatural means revealed the way of life so far as doth suffice. For this cause God hath so many times and ways spoken to the sons of men: neither hath He by speech only, but by writing also, instructed and taught His Church. The cause of writing hath been to the end that things by Him revealed unto the world might have the longer continuance, and the greater certainty of assurance, by how much that which standeth on record hath in both those respects preeminence above that which passeth from hand to hand, and hath no pens but the tongues, no book but the ears of men to record it. The several Books of Scripture having had each some several occasion and peculiar purpose which caused them to be written, the contents whereof are according to the exigence of that special end whereunto they are intended. Hereupon it groweth that every Book of holy Scripture doth take out of all kinds of truth, natural, historical, foreign, supernatural, so much as the matter handled requireth. Now forasmuch as there have been reason alleged sufficient to conclude, that all things necessary unto salvation must be made known, and that God Himself hath

therefore revealed His will, because otherwise men could not have known so much as is necessary; His surceasing to speak to the world, since the publishing of the Gospel of JESUS CHRIST, and the delivery of the same in writing, is unto us a manifest token that the way of salvation is now sufficiently opened, and that we need no other means for our full instruction than GOD hath already furnished us withal. . . . And, therefore, they which add traditions, as a part of supernatural *necessary truth*, have not the truth, but are in error. For they only plead, that whatsoever GOD revealeth as necessary for all Christian men to do or believe, the same we ought to embrace, whether we have received it by writing *or otherwise; which no man denieth*: when that which they should confirm, who claim so great reverence unto traditions, is, that the same traditions are necessary to be acknowledged divine and holy. For we do not reject them only *because they are not in the Scripture*, but because they are neither in Scripture, *nor can otherwise sufficiently* by any reason be proved to be of GOD. That which is of GOD, and may be evidently proved to be so, *we deny not, but it hath in his kind, although unwritten, yet the selfsame force and authority with the written laws of GOD*. It is by ours acknowledged (Whitaker adv. Bellarm. qu. 6, cap. 6), “that the Apostles did in every Church institute and ordain some rites and customs, serving for the seemliness of church-regiment, which rites and customs they have not committed unto writing.” Those rites and customs being known to be apostolical, and having the nature of things changeable, were no less to be accounted of in the Church than other things of the like degree; that is to say, capable in like sort of alteration, although set down in the Apostle’s writings. *For both being known to be apostolical, it is not the manner of delivering them unto the Church, but the author from whom they proceed, which doth give them their force and credit.*—*Laws of Eccl. Pol.* I. xiv. 1—5, ed. Keble.

NOWEL, PRIEST AND DOCTOR.

B. 1507. D. 1602.

Master. Dost thou then affirm that all things necessary to godliness and salvation are contained in the written Word of God? Sufficiency
of holy
Scripture.

Scholar. Yea; for it were a point of intolerable ungodliness and madness to think, either that God hath left an imperfect doctrine, or that man were able to make that perfect which God left imperfect. Therefore the LORD hath most straitly forbidden men, that they neither add any thing to, nor take any thing from, His Word, nor turn any way from it, either to the right hand or to the left.

Ma. If this be true that thou sayest, to what purpose then are so many things so oft in councils, ecclesiastical assemblies, decreed, and by learned men taught in preaching, or left in writing?

Scho. All these things serve either *to expounding of dark places in the Word of God, and to take away controversies* The use of
Councils,
&c. that arise among men, or to the orderly stablishing of the outward governance of the Church, *and not to make new articles of religion.*—*Catechism. Norton's Translation, 1571.*

WHITGIFT, ARCHBISHOP.

B. 1530. D. 1604.

It is most true that nothing ought to be tolerated in the Church, as necessary unto salvation, or as an article of faith, except it be expressly contained in the Word of God, or may manifestly thereof be gathered; and therefore we utterly condemn and reject transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, the authority of the bishop of Rome, worshipping of images, &c. Sufficiency
of holy
Scripture.

And in this case an argument taken “*ab autoritate Scripturæ negativè*,” is most strong: as for example, it is not to be found in Scripture, that the Bishop of Rome ought to be the head of the Church, and therefore it is not necessary to salvation, to believe that he ought to be the

Change of
the Sab-
bath.

Councils
and Fa-
thers.

head of the Church, &c. But that no ceremony, order, discipline, or kind of government may be in the Church, except the same be expressed in the Word of God, is a great absurdity, and breedeth many inconveniences. The Scripture hath not appointed what day in the week should be most meet for the Sabbath-day, whether Saturday, which is the Jew's Sabbath, or the day now observed, which was appointed by the Church. Now if godly Councils or ancient Fathers were any thing at all regarded of these men (as they be not, such is their arrogancy), this controversy might soon be decided.—*Answer to the Admonition*, pp. 45, 46. 4to. Edit. 1573.

BANCROFT, ARCHBISHOP.

B. 1544. D. 1610.

The via
media re-
commend-
ed.

The mean betwixt both the extremities of trying nothing, and curious trying of all things, I hold to be best. And this it is then, when you have attained the true grounds of Christian religion, and are constantly built by a lively faith upon that notable foundation, whereof the Apostle speaketh (1 Cor. iii.), which is JESUS CHRIST, being incorporated into His mystical body (in your baptism) by the HOLY GHOST, and afterwards nourished with the heavenly food exhibited unto you in the LORD'S Supper; you then content yourselves and seek no farther; according to the saying of Tertullian: "Nobis curiositate opus non est post CHRISTUM JESUM; nec inquisitione post Evangelium;" "We need not to be curious after we have apprehended CHRIST JESUS; nor inquisitive after we have received the Gospel." And again, "Cum credimus nihil desideramus ultra quærere;" "When once we believe, we do not desire to seek any farther."

Private men
are to sub-
mit their

Read the Scriptures, but with sobriety. If any man, *presuming upon his knowledge*, seek farther than is meet for him, besides that he knoweth nothing as he ought to know, he shall cast himself into a labyrinth, and never find that he seeketh for. God hath bound himself by His promise unto His Church, of purpose, that men, by her good

direction, might in this point be relieved; *to whose godly judgment to the determination of the Catholic Church.* *determination in matters of question,* her dutiful children ought to submit themselves without any curious or wilful contradiction. I could bring many authorities to this effect. “Those things (saith Athanasius) which have been proved and decreed by so many and so worthy Bishops, *supervacaneum est denuo in judicium revocare*; it is in vain to call again into question.”

When certain men in the Council of Chalcedon began to dispute of some points determined before by the Council of Nice, the Fathers there assembled said all with one voice: “*Si quis retractat, anathema sit; si quis super ista inquirat, anathema sit; maledictus qui addit; maledictus qui aufert; maledictus qui innovat:*” “If any retract, accursed be he; if any *inquire of these things*, accursed be he; accursed be he that addeth; accursed be he that diminisheth; accursed be he that innovateth.”

The Emperors Valentinian and Martian thought it very unmeet that those things which had been once judged of, and well decided by the decrees of godly synods, should again be debated and disputed upon; and both they and divers others made very godly laws for the better containing of busy heads within the compass of this Christian modesty. And surely it is a very true doctrine, that when councils and synods, being lawfully assembled and directed with GOD’S SPIRIT, do resolve upon matters in question, *that private men should content themselves therewith.*—*Sermon on 1 John iv. 1, preached at Paul’s Cross. 12mo. Edit. 1558, pp. 41—43.*

BILSON, BISHOP.

D. 1616.

The Church is the body of CHRIST, and in that respect, *or Synods.* as in our bodies, so in His, not only the members have a common care for the whole, but the principal parts must direct and guide the rest; namely, the eyes to see, the ears to hear, and the mouth to speak for the whole body. Such, therefore, as CHRIST hath placed to be the watchmen and

leaders, the light and salt of His Church, must not only warn and guide, but also *lighten* and *season* in their measure the whole body; for what commission they have from CHRIST, severed and single in their proper charges, the same they must needs retain assembled and joined throughout their circuits. Yea, the LORD so much tendereth the fatherly care and brotherly concord of the pastors of his Church, that He hath promised to be “present in the midst” of their assemblies, and with His SPIRIT to direct them, so they come together, not to accomplish their own lusts and desires, but to sanctify His name by detecting error, resisting wolves, maintaining truth, curing the sores and maladies that fester and poison the members of His body. . . . This course the Apostles taught the Church of CHRIST to follow by their example, when about the question that troubled the Church of Antioch, the Apostles and Elders came together to examine the matter, and to verify their Master’s words to be true; not only the Apostles, but the whole assembly wrote thus in their letters: — “It seemeth good to the HOLY GHOST AND TO US.” For it be sure what the Apostle said, “the HOLY GHOST made you overseers to feed the Church;” and if our SAVIOUR could not be deceived when He said, “He that heareth you heareth Me,” &c. this must be verified as well of pastors assembled as singled; yea, pastors gathered together in CHRIST’s name, are rather assured of His direction and assistance, than when they be severed, unless there be any that thinketh that GOD inspireth one particular person with righteousness, and forsaketh a number of priests assembled in synod, which the Council of Africa reputeth to be very absurd, and repugnant to CHRIST’s promise, so long as they meet together in His name, and not to deface His truth, or oppress their brethren. This hath in all ages, as well before as since the great Council of Nice, been approved and practised as the lawfullest and surest means to discern truth from falsehood, *to decide doubts and strifes*, and redress wrongs in causes ecclesiastical; yea, when there was no believing magistrates to assist the Church, this was the only way to cleanse the House of GOD, as much as might be, from the loathsome

vessels of dishonour; and after Christian princes began to profess and protest the truth, *they never had, nor can have, any better or surer direction amongst men*, than by the synods of wise and godly pastors.—“*The perpetual Government of Christ's Church.*” 4to. Edit. 1610, pp. 372—374.

Catholic should have four conditions by Vincentius's rule. There can nothing be Catholic, unless it be confirmed two ways: first, by the authority of God's law, and next by *the tradition of the Catholic Church*; not that the canon of Scripture is not perfect and sufficient enough for all points of faith, but because men draw and stretch the Scriptures to their fancies, therefore it is very needful that the line of prophetical and apostolical interpretation should be directed by the rule of the ecclesiastical and catholic sense. Now in the Catholic Church herself we must take heed we hold that which hath been believed at all times, in all places, of all persons, for that is truly and properly Catholic.—*The true difference between Christian Subjection and unchristian Rebellion.* Part IV. pp. 546—547. Edit. 1585.

What is
Catholic.

FIELD, PRIEST.

B. 1561. D. 1616.

The right understanding of the promises made, and due condition of the parties to whom they are made, will lead us to a right understanding of the Church's infallibility and assurance of truth. For, seeing, though they be made to all the faithful generally, and to the particular churches as well as the whole, yet they are understood to be performed proportionably, according to the measure and degree of each part, but to the whole Church wholly and entirely; the Church being particular, not only in respect of place, but also of time, the whole is not necessary to be performed to the Church of one time (unless we speak of the primitive, wherein the whole was originally), but to the Church that comprehendeth the whole number of believers that are and have been: in which sense that promise is to

Of promises
made unto
the Church,
how it is
secured
from error,
and the
different
degrees of
obedience
we owe to it.

be understood (John xvi. 13), that "the SPIRIT shall lead the Church into all truth."

Hither we may refer those different degrees of obedience which we must yield to them who command and teach us in the Church of God, excellently described, and set down by Waldensis (Doctrinal. Fidei. lib. 2, art. 2. cap. xxvii.): "We must," saith he, "reverence and respect the authority of the Catholic Doctors, whose doctrines and writings the Church alloweth: we must more regard the authority of Catholic Bishops: more than these, the authority of the Apostolic Churches; amongst them, more especially the Church of Rome; of a General Council more than all these: yet we must not listen so to the determinations of these, nor so certainly assent to them, *as to the things contained in Scripture, or believed by the whole Universal Church* which hath been since the Apostles' time, but as to the instructions of our elders and fatherly admonitions"— "We must," saith he, "obey without scrupulous questioning, with all modesty of mind and reverence of body, with all good allowance, acceptation and repose in the words of them that teach us, unless they teach us any thing which the authority of the higher or superior controlleth; yet so as then, the humble and obedient children of the Church must not insolently insult upon them from whom they are forced to dissent, but must dissent with a reverent, child-like, and respectful shamefulness." This he proveth out of Augustine: (Tom. vii. lib. 2, De Baptismo contra Donat.) "Who knoweth not," saith St. Augustine, "that the sacred and canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are contained within their set and certain bounds, and that they are so, and in such sort, set in a higher degree of authority than any of the writings of the succeeding Bishops, that of them we may not doubt nor make any question whether it be true or right that is there contained. But the writings of the Bishops of the Church, which either have been published since the perfecting of the canon of Scripture, or shall be hereafter, may be censured and reprov'd by the wiser judgment of any that are skilful in the same things whereof they write; or

by the graver authority of other Bishops, and the wisdom of them that are learned themselves and able to teach others: and by the determination of councils if happily (haply) they have gone aside from the truth. And the councils themselves, which are holden in several countries and provinces, must give place to the authority of General Councils gathered and assembled out of the whole Christian world. And of plenary Councils, oftentimes the former are to be corrected by the later, when, by experience and more perfect knowledge of things, that which was shut is opened, and that known which was hidden before. Every [one] of these must be content to yield one to another, without the puff of sacrilegious pride, without swelling arrogancy, without envious contending, with all holy humility, with all catholic peaceable disposition and Christian charity."

Thus then we think that particular men and churches may err damnably, because notwithstanding, others may worship GOD aright, but that the whole Church at one time cannot so err, for that then the Church should cease utterly for a time and so not be catholic, being not at all times, and CHRIST should sometimes be without a Church. Yet, that errors, not prejudicing the salvation of them that err, may be found in the Church that is at one time in the world, we make no doubt, only the whole symbolical and Catholic Church, which is, and was, being wholly free from error. Thus touching the possession of the rich treasures of heavenly truth, I have sufficiently cleared our judgment, which is the same that all wise and learned men have ever been of, to wit, that the Church which comprehendeth the whole number of believers that are and have been since CHRIST appeared in the flesh (so including the Apostles), can neither err in, nor be ignorant of any thing that was to be revealed by CHRIST, the eternal WORD and Angel of the great covenant of GOD. Secondly, that the Church that comprehendeth all the faithful that are and have been since the Apostles, may be ignorant of some things which in process of time shall be known, but *cannot err in any thing*. Thirdly, that all the pastors of this

Church cannot err. Fourthly, that *all the pastors that have committed the treasure of their wisdom and learning to writing cannot err in any thing wherein they CONSENT in their writings*: because it is not possible that they all should have written of any thing but such as touch the very life of the Christian faith generally received in all their times. Fifthly, that it is not possible that all that do speak of a thing, consenting together, should err, if it be a matter of substance, and if in every age some have written of it, though many that have written, be silent and say nothing of it. Sixthly, that the most famous and renowned in all ages, consenting in any thing that toucheth the substance of the Christian faith, and no man dissenting from them, (without note of novelty and singularity,) may not, without intolerable rashness, be charged with error. Seventhly, that though the writings of the ancients may be much corrupted, so that the consent of antiquity cannot always be easily known, yet there will ever be some means to find it out and to descry the errors and frauds of the corrupters; and so I understand that of Vincentius Lirinensis, that the judgment of antiquity is to be sought out at the very first rising of heresies, and not afterwards, when they are grown inveterate, for that then they will corrupt the monuments of antiquity. Eighthly, that the whole *present* Church may be ignorant of some things and err in them, but that in matters *necessary to be known* and believed expressly, *it cannot err*, and that it cannot err in any, the least thing, with pertinacity such and so great as is found in heretics. Ninthly, that Councils and Popes may err in matters of greatest consequence.—*Of the Church*, Book IV. c. 5, Edit. 1635.

Of the rule
of the
Church's
judgment
in matters
of Faith.

It remaineth to show what is the rule of that judgment, whereby the Church discerneth between truth and falsehood, the faith and heresy, and to whom it properly pertaineth to interpret those things which touching this rule are doubtful. . . . The rule of our faith in general, whereby we know it to be true, is the infinite excellency of God. . . . It being [pre]supposed in the generality that

the doctrine of the Christian faith is of God, and containeth nothing but heavenly truth, in the next place, we are to inquire by what rule we are to judge of particular things contained within the compass of it. This rule is, first, the summary comprehension of such principal articles of this divine knowledge, as are the principles whence all other things are concluded and inferred. These are contained in the *Creed of the Apostles*. Secondly, all such things as every Christian is bound expressly to believe, by the light and direction whereof he judgeth of other things, which are not absolutely necessary so particularly to be known. These are rightly said to be the rule of our faith, because the principles of every science are the rule whereby we judge of the truth of all things, as being better and more generally known than any other thing, and the cause of knowing them. Thirdly, the analogy, due proportion, and correspondence, that one thing in this divine knowledge hath with another, so that men cannot err in one of them without erring in another, nor rightly understand one, but they must likewise rightly conceive the rest. Fourthly, whatsoever *Books* were delivered unto us, as written by them, to whom the first and immediate revelation of the divine truth was made. Fifthly, whatsoever hath been delivered by all the saints with one consent, which have left their judgment and opinion in writing. Sixthly, whatsoever the most famous have constantly and uniformly delivered, as a matter of faith, no man contradicting, though many [other] ecclesiastical writers be silent, and say nothing of it. Seventhly, that which the most, and most famous in every age, constantly delivered as matter of faith, and as received of them that went before them, in such sort that the contradicters and gainsayers were in their beginnings noted for singularity, novelty, and division, and afterwards in process of time (if they persisted in such contradiction) charged with heresy.

These three latter rules of [our] faith we admit, not because they are equal with the former, and originally in themselves contain the direction of our faith, but because nothing can be delivered with such and so full consent of

the people of God, as in them is expressed, but it must needs be from those first authors and founders of our Christian profession. The Romanists add unto these, the decrees of Councils and determinations of Popes, making these also to be the rules of faith; but because we have no proof of *their* infallibility, we number them not with the rest.

Thus then we see, how many things in several degrees and sorts are said to be rules of our faith. The infinite excellency of God, [as that whereby the truth of the heavenly doctrine is proved. The articles of faith, and other verities ever expressly known in the Church, as the first principles, are the canon by which we judge of conclusions from thence inferred. The Scripture, as containing in it all that doctrine of faith, which CHRIST the SON of GOD delivered. The uniform practice and consenting judgment of them that went before us, as a *certain and undoubted explication of the things contained in the Scripture.*

The Scripture (saith Vincentius Lirinensis) is *full and sufficient to all purposes*, but, because of the manifold turnings of heretics, it is necessary that the line of prophetic and apostolical *interpretation* be drawn down and directed unto us, *according to the rule of ecclesiastical and catholic sense.* So then *we do not make Scripture the rule of our faith, but that other things in their kind are rules likewise*; in such sort, *that it is not safe*, without respect had unto them, to judge things by the Scripture alone. For without the first rule, we cannot know the Scripture to be of God. Without the second and third, we have no form of Christian doctrine, by the direction whereof to judge of particular doubts and questions. Without the other rules, *we cannot know* the authors and number of the Books of Scripture, *nor the meaning of the things therein written.* For who shall be able to understand them, but he that is settled in these things which the Apostles presupposed in their delivery of the Scripture. We do not, therefore, *so make Scripture the rule of our faith as to neglect the other*, nor so admit the other as to

detract any thing from the plenitude of the Scripture in which ALL THINGS are contained which *must* be believed.—
Of the Church, Book IV. c. 14.

Much contention there hath been about traditions, some urging the necessity of them, and others rejecting them. For the clearing whereof we must observe, that though we reject the uncertain and vain traditions of the Papists, yet we reject not all. For, first, we receive the number and names of the authors of Books divine and canonical, as delivered by tradition. This tradition we admit, for that, though the Books of Scripture have not their authority from the approbation of the Church, but win credit of themselves, and yield sufficient satisfaction to all men, of their divine truth, whence we judge the Church that receiveth them, to be led by the SPIRIT of GOD; yet the number, authors, and integrity of the parts of these Books, we receive as delivered by tradition.

What traditions are received by the Anglican Church.

The second kind of tradition which we admit, is that summary comprehension of the chief heads of Christian doctrine, contained in the Creed of the Apostles, which was delivered to the Church *as a rule of her faith*. For though every part thereof be contained in the Scripture, yet the orderly connexion and distinct explication of these principal articles gathered into an epitome wherein are implied, and whence are inferred, all conclusions theological, is rightly named a tradition. The third, is that form of Christian doctrine, and explication of the several parts thereof, which the first Christians receiving of the same Apostles that delivered to them the Scriptures, commended to posterities. This may rightly be named a tradition, not as if we were to believe any thing, without the warrant and authority of the Scripture, but for that we need a plain and distinct explication of many things which are somewhat obscurely contained in the Scripture: which being explicated, the Scriptures, which otherwise we should not so easily have understood, yield us satisfaction that they are so indeed as the Church delivereth them unto us. The fourth kind of tradition, is the continued practice of such things as neither are contained in the Scripture expressly, nor the

examples of such practice expressly there delivered, though the grounds, reasons, and causes of the necessity of such practice, be there contained, and the benefit or good that followeth of it. Of this sort is the baptism of infants, which is therefore named a tradition, because it is not expressly delivered in Scripture, that the Apostles did baptize infants, nor any express precept there found, that they should so do. Yet is not this so received by bare and naked tradition, but that we find the Scripture to deliver unto us the grounds of it. The fifth kind of tradition comprehendeth such observations, as in particular are not commanded in Scripture, nor the necessity of them from thence concluded, though in general without limitation of times, and other circumstances, such things be there commanded.—*Of the Church*, Book IV. c. 20.

Of the rules
whereby true
traditions
may be
known from
counterfeits.

Thus having set down the kinds and sorts of traditions, it remaineth to examine by what means we may come to discern, and by what rules we may judge, which are true and indubitate traditions. The first rule is delivered by Augustine; “*Quod universa tenet ecclesia, nec consiliis institutum, sed semper retentum est, non nisi auctoritate Apostolicâ traditum, rectissime creditur.*” (Lib. IV. contra Donatistas, c. 23.) Whatsoever the whole Church holdeth, not being decreed by the authority of councils, but having been ever holden, may rightly be thought to have proceeded from apostolic authority. The second rule is, whatsoever all, or the most famous and renowned in all ages, or at least in diverse ages, have constantly delivered, as received from them that went before them, no man contradicting or doubting of it, may be thought to be an apostolical tradition. The third rule, is the constant testimony of the pastors of an Apostolic Church, successively delivered: to which some add the *present* testimony of an Apostolic Church, whose declinings when they began, we cannot precisely tell. But none of the Fathers admit this rule. For when they urge the authority and testimony of Apostolic Churches, for the proof or reproof of true or pretended traditions, they stand upon the consenting voice, or silence, of the pastors of such churches, successively in diverse ages concerning such

things. Some add the testimony of the present Church: but we inquire after the rule, whereby the present Church may know true traditions from false; and besides, though the whole multitude of believers, at one time in the world, cannot err pertinaciously, and damnably, in embracing false traditions instead of true; yet they that most sway things in the Church may, yea even the greater part of a General Council; so that this can be no sure rule to judge of traditions by.—*Ibid.* c. 21.

Touching the *interpretations* which the Fathers have delivered, *we receive them as undoubtedly true*, in the *general doctrine* they consent in, and so far forth esteem them as authentic. Yet we do think that *holding the faith of the Fathers*, it is lawful to dissent from their interpretation in some *particular places*, which the greater part of them have delivered, or perhaps all that have written of them; and to find out some other, not mentioned by any of the ancients.—*Ibid.* c. 16.

Of the interpretation of the Fathers.

OVERALL, BISHOP.

B. 1559. D. 1619.

I believe there are few things in your book which will not be approved of by the Bishop of Ely (Launcelot Andrews) and the rest of our more learned divines, unless, perhaps, they may hesitate respecting those passages which seem to give to lay-powers a definitive judgment in matters of faith; to deny the true power and jurisdiction of the pastors of the Church; and to rank episcopacy among unnecessary things. . . . For our divines hold, that the right of definitive judgment in matters of faith, is to be given to synods of bishops and other learned ministers of the Church, chosen and convened for this purpose, according to the usage of the ancient Church: who shall determine from the Holy Scriptures, *explained by consent of the ancient Church, not by the private spirit of Neoterics*.—Translated from *Epistol. præst. et erud. Viror.*, p. 486. *Bp. Jebb's Sermons. Appendix*, pp. 388, 389.

Holy Scripture is to be interpreted by the consent of the ancient Church.

MASON, PRIEST.

B. 1566. D. 1621.

Of decisive
judgment in
controversies of faith.

Orthodox. Decisive judgment is twofold; imperial and ministerial. The former is authentic and infallible, which belongs only to CHRIST, together with the FATHER and the HOLY GHOST.

Philodox. What is to be the supreme judgment upon earth in controversies of faith?

Holy Scripture the test of divine truth.

Orth. If you mean a judgment authoritatively decisive, which is simply infallible and authentic, you have had my opinion already. But if you mean a *ministerial* one, the judgment of a General Council doth far outweigh the judgment of the Pope. For the Scripture saith: "the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets." (1 Cor. xiv. 32.) It doth not say to Peter, nor to the Pope, nor to any one; but to "the prophets," that is, to a company or assembly of the prophets. But a General Council is much the most famous assembly of the prophets: and therefore the "spirits of the prophets are to be subject" to this. But "things ordained by such councils, as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority unless it may be declared that they are taken out of holy Scripture" (Acts xxi.), as the Church of England truly teacheth. Therefore the decrees of councils are to be conformed to this, as to the rule [i. e. *standard*], that all men may rest upon the faith of the divine truth, and not upon the specious appearance of human authority. For GOD delegated to His prophets no more than *the ministry of giving judgment*. They must, therefore, only give sentence according to the written will of CHRIST. Thus the holy Scripture alone is the absolute rule; and the HOLY GHOST alone, speaking in the Scriptures, is the infallible Judge.—*Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ. Translated by Lindsay.* Fol. 1728. Book III. c. iii. pp. 229, 231.

Orth. We teach that it is the duty of subjects to pay their princes a religious obedience in the LORD, if they

command what is lawful; and that for conscience' sake. And we call those things lawful which are not contrary to the holy Scripture.

Phil. Is not that giving private persons a power to judge of controversies of faith, or the commands of their superiors?

Orth. There is a twofold judgment, public and private. Of public and private judgment. I call that *public* which is laid down as a rule for others; and this belongs not to private persons. And that *private*, whereby any one diligently seeks out those things which are necessary to his soul's health, to inform and instruct his own conscience in the private duties towards God and man; and this belongs to all the faithful according to those golden sentences of the Apostle: "I speak as unto wise men; judge ye what I say." (1 Cor. x. 15.) "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." (1 Thess. v. 21.) "Try the spirits whether they are of God." (1 John iv. 1.)—Book III. c. v. p. 262.

Orth. You suppose that your form of ordination was brought down to you from the Apostles; but how do you prove it?

Phil. Since there can be no beginning of the Roman rites found after the Apostles' days, you may safely conclude with St. Augustine, that they were brought down from the Apostles themselves.

Orth. Let us therefore turn to the words of St. Augustine. He says: "That which the universal Church doth hold, and was not enjoined by the Councils, but was always retained, is rightly believed to have the authority of apostolical tradition." So saith he. But *how* doth it appear that *your* form was always retained by the universal Church?—Book II. c. xvi. p. 187. St. Augustine's test of Tradition.

ANDREWS, BISHOP AND DOCTOR.

B. 1555. D. 1626.

Now from these two sorts of persons proceeded those two several means, whereby (as it were in two moulds) all imaginations have been cast, and the truth of God's Word Private interpretations of Scripture condemned.

ever perverted. 1. From the Pharisee, that piecing out the *new garment* with *old rags* of *traditions* (Matt. ix. 17); that adding to and eking out God's truth, with men's fancies; with the phylacteries and fringes of the Pharisees, who took upon them to observe many things beside it. (Mark vii. 4.) 2. From the philosopher, that wresting and tentering of the Scriptures (which St. Peter complaineth of, 2 Pet. iii. 16), with expositions and glosses newly coined, to make them speak that they never meant. Giving such *new* and *strange* senses to places of Scripture, *as the Church of CHRIST never heard of*. And what words are there or can there be, that (being helped out with the Pharisee's addition of a *truth unwritten*, or tuned with the philosopher's wrest of a *devised sense*,) may not be made to give colour to a new imagination? Therefore the ancient Fathers thought it meet, that they that would take upon them to interpret the Apostle's doctrine, should put in sureties, that their senses they gave were no other than the Church in former times hath acknowledged. It is true, the Apostles indeed spake from the SPIRIT, and every affection of theirs was an oracle: but that (I take it) was their peculiar privilege. But all that are after them, speak not by revelation, but by "labouring in the word" and learning, *are not to utter their own fancies*, and to desire to be believed upon their bare word: (if this be not *dominari fidei*, to be lords of their auditor's faith, I know not what it is:) but only on condition that the sense they now give be not a feigned sense (as St. Peter termeth it), but such a one, *as hath been before given by our Fathers and forerunners in the Christian faith*. "Say I this of myself (saith the Apostle), saith not the law" so too? Give I this sense of mine own head, *hath not CHRIST's Church heretofore given the like?* Which one course, if it were straitly holden, would rid our Church of many fond imaginations which now are stamped daily, because *every man* upon his own single bond, *is trusted to deliver the meaning of any Scripture*, which is many times nought else but his own imagination. This is the disease of our age. Not the Pharisee's *addition* (which is well left); but (*as bad as it*) the philosopher's *gloss*,

which too much aboundeth. *And I see no way but this to help it.*—*Sermon on Acts ii. ver. 42. Sermons. Fol. Lond. 1631.*

DONNE, PRIEST.

B. 1573. D. 1631.

And then it [the doctrine of prayers for the dead] grew to a farther height, from a wild flower in the field, and a garden flower in private grounds, to be more generally planted, and to be not only suffered by many Fathers, but cherished and watered by some, and not above forty years after Epiphanius, to be so far advanced by St. Chrysostom, as that he assigns, though no Scripture for it, *yet that which is nearest to Scripture*, that it was an apostolical constitution. And truly, if it did clearly appear to have been so—a thing practised and prescribed to the Church by the Apostles, the HOLY GHOST *were as well to be believed in the Apostles' mouths as in their pens.* An apostolical tradition, *that is truly so*, is good evidence. But because those things do hardly lie in proof, therefore we must apply St. Augustine's words to St. Chrysostom: "Lege ex Lege, ex Prophetis, ex Psalmis, ex Evangelio, ex Apostolicis literis, et credemus:"—"Read us any thing out of the Law, the Prophets, or Psalms, or Gospels, or Epistles, and we will believe it."—*Sermon on 1 Cor. xv. 29. Sermons. Fol. 1640. Vol. i. pp. 781, 782.*

An apostolical constitution is second only to Holy Scripture in authority.

When CHRIST says to the Church, "Fear not, little flock," (Luke xii. 32,) it was not—"Quia de magno minuitur, sed quia de pusillo crescit," says Chrysologus, not because it should fall from great to little, but rise from little to great. Such care had CHRIST to the growth thereof; and then such care of the establishment and power thereof, as that the first time that ever He names the Church, He invests it with the assurance of perpetuity: "Upon this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (Matt. xvi. 18.) Therein is denoted the strength and stability of

The authority of the Catholic Church.

the Church in itself, and then the power and authority of the Church upon others, in those often directions,—“dic Ecclesiæ,” complain to the Church and consult with the Church; and then “audi Ecclesiam,” hearken to the Church, be judged by the Church, hear not them that hear not the Church; and then “ejice de Ecclesia,” let them that disobey the Church be cast out of the Church. In all which we are forbidden private conventicles, private spirits, *private opinions*. For, as St. Augustine says well, (and he cites it from another whom he names not, quidam dixit,) If a wall stand single, not joined to any other wall, he that makes a door through the wall, and passes through that door, “adhuc foris est,” for all this is without still, “nam domus non est.” One wall makes not a house; one opinion makes not catholic doctrine, one man makes not a Church. *For this knowledge of God the Church is our academy.* There we must be bred, and there we may be bred all our lives and yet learn nothing. Therefore, as we must be there, so *there we must use the means*; and the means in the Church are the ordinances and institutions of the Church. The most powerful means is the Scripture; but the Scripture *in the Church*. Not that we are discouraged from reading the Scripture at home. At home, the HOLY GHOST is with thee in the reading of the Scriptures; but there He is with thee as a Remembrancer. “The HOLY GHOST shall bring to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you,” (John xiv. 26,) says our SAVIOUR. Here, *in the Church*, He is with thee as a Doctor, to teach thee. First learn at Church, and then meditate at home: receive the seed by hearing the Scriptures interpreted here, and water it by returning to those places at home. When CHRIST bids you “search the Scriptures,” *He means you should go to them who have a warrant to search*, a warrant in their calling. To know which are the Scriptures, *to know what the HOLY GHOST says in the Scriptures*, APPLY THYSELF TO THE CHURCH. Not that the Church is a judge above *the Scriptures*, (for the power and commission the Church hath, it hath from the Scriptures,) but the Church is a judge above *thee*, which

are the Scriptures, and what is the sense of the HOLY GHOST in them. — *Sermon on 1 Cor. xiii. 12. Sermons, vol. i. p. 228.*

WHITE, BISHOP.

D. 1637.

The Holy Scripture is the fountain and living spring, containing in all-sufficiency and abundance the pure water of life, and whatsoever is necessary to make God's people wise unto salvation. The consentient and unanimous testimony of the true Church of CHRIST in the primitive ages thereof, is "canalis," a conduit-pipe to derive and convey to succeeding generations the celestial water contained in the Holy Scriptures. . . . The ecclesiastical story reporteth of Nazianzen and Basil, that in their studying the Holy Scriptures they collected the sense of them, not from their own judgment or presumption, but from the testimony and authority of the ancients, who had received the rule of the true intelligence of Scripture from the holy Apostles by succession. . . . *The Reformed Churches reject not all traditions*, but such as are spurious, superstitious, and not consonant to the prime rule of faith, to wit, the holy Scripture; but genuine traditions, agreeable to the rule of faith, subservient to piety, consonant with holy Scripture, derived from the apostolical times by a successive current, and which have the uniform testimony of pious antiquity, are received and honoured by us. Now such are those which follow the historical tradition concerning the number, integrity, dignity, and perfection of the Books of Canonical Scripture, the Catholic exposition of many sentences of Scripture, the Apostles' Creed, the baptism of infants, the perpetual virginity of the blessed Virgin Mary, the righteous observation of the Lord's day, and some other festivals, as Easter, Pentecost, &c., baptizing and administration of the holy Eucharist in public assemblies and congregations, the service of the Church in a known language, the delivering of the Communion to the people in both kinds, the superiority and authority

Of Scripture
and Tradition.

of bishops over priests and deacons in jurisdiction and power of ordination, &c.—*On the Sabbath*, pp. 12, 14, 97.

JACKSON, PRIEST AND DOCTOR.

B. 1579. D. 1640.

That the title of Catholic is proper and essential to the faith professed by the Anglican Church, but cannot truly be attributed to the creed of the Church of Rome.

Whether the name *Catholic* were first bestowed upon the Church, or upon the faith which is the life and soul of the holy, apostolic Church, shall be no part of our inquiry. It sufficeth that the name *Catholic* itself is univocal in respect both of Church and faith. True faith is therefore Catholic faith, because it is the only door or way unto salvation, alike common unto all, without national or topical respect. Whosoever of any nation have been saved, have been saved by this one and the same faith; and whosoever will be saved, as Athanasius speaks, must hold the “Catholic faith,” and he must hold it “pure and undefiled.” The main question then is, who they be that hold this Catholic faith, and whether they hold it undefiled or no.

Were Vincentius his rules as artificial as they are orthodoxical and honest, the issue betwixt us and the Romanist would be very easy and triable. But let us take them as they are: “*Id catholicum est quod ab omnibus, ubique et semper, &c.*,”—that is Catholic, which is held *by all in all places, and at all times.*”

The three special notes of the Catholic Faith or Church, by him required, are *Universality*, *Antiquity*, and *Consent*. Whether these three members be different or subordinate, and oftentimes coincident, I leave it to be scanned by logicians. According to the author’s limitation, all three marks agree to us, not to the Romanist.

First, concerning *Universality*, the question is not, whether at this present time, or in any former age for these thousand years past, there are or have been more, which profess the present Romish religion established in the Church of Rome, than the religion established in the Reformed Churches since the separation was made. If we should come to calculate voices after this manner, whether will you be a Roman Catholic or a Protestant: they might, perhaps,

have three for one amongst such as profess themselves Christians, ready to cry, "I am not for the Protestants; but for the Roman Catholics will I be." But it was far from Vincentius his meaning, that *Universality* should be measured after this fashion; for he very well knew that the Arian faction had prevailed especially by this tumultuary kind of canvass or calculation. The multitude of voices thus taken for them, may prove their faction to be stronger and greater than our Church; it cannot prove their faith to be so universal as our faith is. The fallacy by which the Romanists deceive poor simple people, is in making them believe, that our religion and their religion, our faith and their faith are "*duo prima diversa*," or so totally distinct, that part of the one could not be included in the other. But for the *universality* of our faith we have every member of the Roman Church a suffragan or witness for us. First, nothing is held as a point of faith in our Church, but the present Romish Church doth hold the same, and confess the same to have been held by all orthodoxal antiquity. So that for the form of faith established in our Church, we have the consent of the primitive Church, of the four first General Councils, of all succeeding ages unto this present day, the consent likewise of the present Romish Church, and of ourselves. Now as France is a great deal bigger than Normandy, if we compare them as distinct and opposite, and yet France and Normandy is bigger than France without Normandy: so likewise though the present visible Romish Church be much greater than the Church of England, yet seeing the Romish Church, how great soever, doth hold all the points of faith which our Church doth, for Catholic and orthodoxal; our consent, and their consent, our confession and their confession, is more universal than their consent without ours. But if their consent unto the points of faith believed by us, prove our faith to be universal, and our Church by consequence to be Catholic; why should not our consent unto the points of faith believed by them, prove their faith to be universal, or their Church to be Catholic? Because it is not enough to hold all points of Catholic faith, unless the same points be kept

holy and undefiled. The Romish Church, we grant, doth hold all points of Catholic faith, and so far as she holds these points, we dissent not from her : yet dissent from her we do, in that she hath *defiled* and polluted the Catholic faith, with new and poisonous doctrines ; for which she neither hath the consent of antiquity, nor of the Reformed Churches. And in respect of these doctrines, she stands convicted of schism and heresy, by Vincentius his rules. For it is with him a fundamental rule, that no present visible Church hath any authority to commend any thing as a point of faith to posterity, which hath not been commended to the said Church by antiquity derived from the Apostles' times. A proficiency or growth in faith, he allows and granteth, "*modò sit in eodem genere,*" so it be in the same kind, or proceed from the same root ; but for additions or new inventions, he takes them for the marks of schism and heresy.

So then we hold the Catholic faith, and they hold the Catholic faith. And seeing they hold the Catholic faith in the same measure that we do, is it not reason they should be termed Catholics as well as we, though not so good Catholics as we ? No reason they should be termed Catholics at all. Where is the difference ? In this. *We* hold it pure and undefiled, *they* have defiled and polluted it for many generations, and do still defile it with many loathsome additions and inventions. Now in this case the denomination followeth the worser part, that is, they are not so much to be reputed Catholics for that they hold the Catholic faith, as to be adjudged heretics and schismatics, because they have defiled and polluted it with many new inventions, and being admonished hereof and reproved, will not purify their faith, will not reform their religion according to the rule of faith and the practice of antiquity. Their faith not purified from the additions of the second Nicene and Trent Council, can be no Catholic faith. Their religion not reformed, can be no true religion, save only in reference to Paganism, Judaism, or Mahometism. For as Dionysius saith, "*Bonum non est nisi ex integra causa, malum ex quolibet defectu.*" Nothing is good which

is not entire and sound, evil ariseth from every defect. Every new addition or invention in matters of faith or doctrine, is enough to make that Church schismatical, which before was Catholic and orthodoxal. Catholic and orthodoxal no Church can be, unless it hold all points of faith without admixture of human inventions or of new articles. The admixture of a great deal of man's meat with a little swine's meat, makes the whole dish to be no man's meat, but swine's meat. Our Church, according to Vincentius his rule admits a growth or proficiency in faith, in that it holds not only those propositions which are expressly contained in Scripture, but such as may by necessary consequence be *deduced out of them*, for points of faith, and this growth is still in *eodem genere*, from the same root. *Other points of faith besides these, our Church admitteth none*, but ties even her Prelates and Governors, to obtrude no other doctrines as points of faith upon their auditors, than such as are either *expressly contained in Scriptures, or may infallibly be deduced from them*. And this is the fundamental and radical difference between our Church and the Romish Church, which admitteth such an illimited increase or growth of faith as is in heaps or congests of heterogeneals.

The pain-worthiest inquiry in this argument, were first to make search what additions, or adinventions unto the ancient or primitive Canon of Catholic faith have been made, received or authorized by the Romish Church, since the Council of Ephesus, which was some three years before Vincentius Lirinensis wrote his admonitions concerning this point; and in what age and upon what occasions such additions have been made or received. Secondly, to make proof or demonstration, how far and in what manner such additions do corrupt or contaminate the holy Catholic faith; and how far each or all of them, jointly or severally, do undermine or overthrow the holy Catholic faith.

The first addition or adinvention of moment, which comes into my memory, is the invocation of saints and veneration of images. Both which points were added as articles of faith or parts of the Creed which all were bound to

believe and profess, by Tharasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, and President of that illiterate, parasitical and factious assembly, which hath been commonly styled the seventh general or second Nicene Council. In these and the like abominable decrees, the then Bishop of Rome was Tharasius's accomplice, his instigator and abettor, as may appear from the speeches of his Legates in that Council, and by his own Epistles, although part of the Epistle may be justly suspected to have been framed since. But by what spirit this Council was managed, or in whose name they met together, I refer the reader unto that learned Treatise in the Book of Homilies (whereunto we have all subscribed), concerning the peril of idolatry, especially the Third Part. What ingenuous minds of this kingdom thought of that Council, before either the author of these Homilies or Luther was born, may in part be gathered from an ancient English historiographer, who saith the Church of God did hold this decree in execration.

The self-same points, with a great many more of like or worse nature, all whatsoever any council which the Romish Church accounteth general or œcumenical, or any Canons which the same Church accounteth Catholic, even all decrees whereto the Trent Council hath affixed their anathemas, have been annexed by Pius Quartus to the Nicene Creed, and are inserted as principal points of that oath which every Roman Bishop at his consecration is to take; one part of which oath or solemn vow it likewise is, that every Bishop shall exact the like confession of his inferiors to be ratified by oath or solemn vow, "*Cætera omnia à sacris,*" &c.

The particular decree concerning invocation of saints and adoration of images, is much enlarged by the Trent Council, and by Pius Quartus. But of the equivalency of idolatry in Rome Heathen, and Rome Christian, elsewhere at large. In this one point, to omit others, the present Romish Church far exceeds the Eastern Church, in the time of the second Nicene Council, in that it ratifies the worshipping of all such saints as are canonized by the Pope.

The second addition made by the Roman Church unto the ancient canon of faith, is a transcendant one, and illimited; and that is, *the making of ecclesiastical tradition to be an integral part of the canon of faith*. This doth not only pollute but undermine the whole fabric of the holy, primitive and Catholic faith. That there is a certain rule or authentic canon of faith, is a principle wherein the ancient primitive Church, the modern Roman, and all Reformed Churches agree. The first point of difference betwixt us is, about the extent of the written canon, especially of the Old Testament. The main points of difference are these. First, we affirm with antiquity, and in particular with Vincentius Lirinensis, that the canon of Scripture is *a rule of faith, perfect for quantity and sufficient for quality*; that is, it contains all things in it that are necessary to salvation, or requisite to be contained in any rule; and so contains them as they may be believed and understood, without relying on any other rule or authority *equivalent* to them in certainty, or *more authentic* in respect of us, than the Scriptures are. The modern Romish Church denies the canon of Scripture to be perfect and complete in respect of its quantity, or sufficient for its quality or efficacy. To supply the defect of its quantity, they add tradition, *as another part of the same rule*, homogeneous and equivalent to it for quality. To supply the insufficiency as well of canonical Scriptures as of tradition in respect of their quality or efficacy towards us, they add the infallible authority of the present visible Church. The former addition of unwritten tradition *as part of the infallible rule* doth undermine: this latter addition of the Church's infallible and absolute authority as well in determining the extent, as in declaring the true sense and meaning of the whole rule, utterly pulls down the structure of faith: yet when we reject ecclesiastical tradition from being any part of the rule of faith, *we do not altogether deny the authority or use of it*. Howbeit that ecclesiastical tradition, whereof there was such excellent use in the primitive Church, was not unwritten tradition, or customs commended or ratified by the supposed infallibility of any

The difference between the Anglican and Roman Churches concerning the rule of Faith.

True Eccle-
siastical
Tradition
shown to be
Apostolic
and Divine.

visible Church. That ecclesiastical tradition which Vincentius Lirinensis so much commends, did especially consist in the confessions or registers of particular Churches. Now the unanimous consent of so many several Churches, as exhibited their confessions to the Nicene Council, being not dependent one of another, not overswayed by authority, nor misled by faction to frame the confessions of their faith by imitation, or according to some pattern set them, but voluntarily and freely exhibiting such confessions as had been framed and taught before these controversies arose, was a pregnant argument to any impartial understanding man, that this faith wherein they all agreed, *had been delivered unto them by the Apostles* and their followers, by the first planters of the Churches thus agreeing; a pregnant argument, likewise, that these first planters had been inspired and *taught by one and the same Spirit*. Each particular Church was a competent or authentic witness of every other Church's integrity and fidelity *in servando depositum*, in carefully preserving the truth committed to their special trust. On the contrary, in that Arius, Eutyches, Nestorius, and other heretics, did obtrude such constructions of Scriptures upon their auditors as had nowhere been heard of before, but sprung up with themselves, or from the places where they lived, this was an argument more than probable, that if the Apostles had delivered the whole form of wholesome doctrine unto posterity, (a point questioned by no Church in those times) these men, or the particular Churches which abetted them, had not kept the doctrine delivered unto them by our SAVIOUR and His Apostles; but had corrupted or defiled it with the idle fancies of their own brains, or with the muddy conceit of their discontented passions.

To speak more briefly, though perhaps more fully: the unanimous consent of so many distinct visible Churches, as exhibited their several confessions, catechisms, or testimonies of their own and their forefathers' faith, unto the four first Œcumenical Councils, was an argument of the same force and efficacy, against Arius and other heretics, for whose conviction these councils were called, as the

general consent and practice of all nations in worshipping some Divine power or other, hath been in all ages, against the Atheists. Nothing, besides the ingrafted notion of a Deity or Divine power, could have inclined so many several nations, so much different in natural disposition, in civil discipline and education, to affect or practice the duty of adoration. *Nothing besides the evidence of truth delivered unto the Christian world by CHRIST and His Apostles, could have kept so many several Churches, as communicated their confessions unto the councils of Nice and Ephesus, &c. in the unity of the same faith.*

Howbeit this unanimous tradition ecclesiastic, was not in these times held for any proper part of the rule of faith, but alleged only as an inducement to incline the hearts of such as before acknowledged the *written word* for the *only rule* of faith, *to believe that the interpretations or decisions of those councils, did contain the true sense and meaning of the rule acknowledged by all.* So that the written tradition which Vincentius so much commends, was not by the Nicene Council used to any such purpose as the Romanists now use unwritten traditions. The only use of it was to direct the present Church in her examination of the Catholic truth, or points of faith. The chief *authority* which the visible Church then challenged, did consist in the *unanimous consent* of the ecclesiastic tradition, and that (as was said before) but an inducement to embrace the interpretations of the present Church, and reject the interpretations of upstart heretics.

But was it a received truth in these primitive times, or a truth acknowledged by Vincentius (the pretended patron of Roman Catholic tradition), that the joint consent of so many bishops, as were assembled in the first Council of Nice, or the joint confessions of so many several dioceses as were then delivered to that council, should unto the world's end continue an argument or inducement of like force or validity, as it then was, either for establishment of the canons which succeeding councils should make, or for condemning such opinions as with the consent of as many (or more) bishops, as were there assembled, should be con-

demned for heresies? No, the same Vincentius hath given posterity a caveat, as full of wisdom as of religion; in some cases not to admit of his former admonition, concerning the trial of Catholic faith, either for refelling heresies, or for establishing the truth. The limitation of his former admonition is, in his own words, thus. As for ancient and inveterate heresies, they are not in anywise to be refuted by the former method, because continuance of time (after heresies be once set on foot) may afford heretics many opportunities of stealing truth out of the writings of the ancient, or for exchanging orthodoxal antiquity with profane novelties.

Now what opportunities of falsification did these eight hundred years last past afford, which the Roman Church was not always ready to take? The opportunities afforded by dissolution of the Roman empire and variance of Christian kings, first made the Roman Clergy such sacrilegious thieves, as Vincentius supposeth any opportunity may make heretics to be. And the Roman Church, being flesht with the spoil of CHRIST's flock and Christian Churches through the West, have not been wanting unto themselves in devising new opportunities in coining a new act of falsifying antiquity, of stealing the consent and suffrages of the Christian world, from orthodoxal and primitive truth. So that if this controversy may be examined and discussed by Vincentius's rules, since the first acknowledgment of the Pope's supremacy, since the making of edicts for the acknowledging of it, since the exemption of clerks from royal or civil jurisdiction; all the written testimonies, or unwritten traditions, which the children of the Romish Church do or can rake together, are void in law, and void in conscience: there is not so much as one legal single testimony, but all are as a multitude of false and illegal witnesses, of parties or conspirators in their own cause.

But although heresies of long standing and continuance cannot be refuted, nor may not be assaulted, in Vincentius's judgment, by the former method, that is, by multitude of suffragants, or joint consent of several provinces, is there therefore no other means left to convince them, no way left to eschew them? Yes, we may "*eschew* them (saith he),

as *already condemned by ancient and orthodoxal Councils*; or we may *convince* them, so it be needful or expedient, *by the sole authority of Scriptures.*" Now if the Scriptures be sufficient to convince heresies of long continuance or long standing, and to confute such heretics, as want neither wit, will, nor opportunity to falsify ancient records, and imprint traditions of their own coining with inscriptions of antiquity, I hope the same Scripture was (in Vincentius's judgment) a rule of faith neither incomplete for its quantity, nor insufficient for its quality: a rule every way competent for ending controversies in religion, without the assumption either of tradition or decrees of council, *as any associates or homogeneal parts* of the same rule.

Unto what use then did ecclesiastical tradition, or general Councils serve for quelling heresies? Ecclesiastical traditions or unanimous consent of particular Churches throughout several kingdoms or provinces in points of faith, was in ancient times, and yet may be an excellent means, by which the SPIRIT of GOD leads General Councils into the truth. And the Councils whose care and office it was to compare and examine traditions exhibited, *were the sovereign and principal means, under the guidance of GOD'S SPIRIT*, by which as many as embraced *the love of truth*, were led into all those truths, which are at all times necessary to salvation, but were much questioned and obscured by the jugglings and falsifications of former heretics. Into the same truths which these Councils were then, we now are led, not by relying upon the *sole authority* of the Councils which the SPIRIT did lead, but *by tracing their footsteps, and viewing the way by which the SPIRIT did lead them.* And this was by necessary deductions or consequences, which reason, enlightened by the SPIRIT, and directed by the sweet disposition of Divine Providence, did teach them to make, and doth enable us to judge that they were truly made by them.—*A Treatise of the Holy Catholic Faith and Church.* 4to. 1627. Ch. xxi. xxii. pp. 180—194.

MONTAGUE, BISHOP.

B. 1577. D. 1641.

Unwritten traditions.

Where is it bidden in Scripture to baptize infants, or to administer to communicants in the LORD'S Supper under both kinds? There are ever so many instances in sacred matters, instituted by GOD, committed to the Church, practised by the Church, of which, notwithstanding it may be declared, Scripture teacheth nothing such, Scripture does not preach these things.—*Orig. Eccles.* ii. 67, p. 396.

CHILLINGWORTH, PRIEST.

B. 1602. D. 1644.

A profession of Faith.

I profess sincerely that I believe all those books of Scripture, which the Church of England accounts canonical, to be the infallible Word of GOD: I believe all things evidently contained in them; all things evidently, or even probably deducible from them; I acknowledge all that to be heresy, which by the act of parliament *primo* of Q. Eliz., is declared to be so, and only to be so; and though in such points which may be held diversely of divers men, *salva fidei compage*, I would not take any man's liberty from him, and humbly beseech all men that they would not take mine from me; yet thus much I can say (which I hope will satisfy any man of reason), that *whatsoever hath been held necessary to salvation, either by the Catholic Church of all ages, or by the consent of Fathers, measured by Vincentius Lirinensis's rule, or is held necessary, either by the Catholic Church of this age, or by the consent of Protestants, or even by the Church of England, that, against the Socinians and all others whatsoever, I do verily believe and embrace.*—*Works*, 8vo. 1820. Vol. I. pp. 55, 56.

The Church of England, at the Reformation, did not separate from "universality, antiquity, and consent."

Your allegations out of Vincentius, Prosper, and Cyprian, are liable to these exceptions. . . . The first and last are merely impertinent, neither of them affirming or intimating that separation from the present visible Church is a mark of heresy; and the former, speaking plainly of separation

from *universality, consent, and antiquity*, which, if you will presume without proof that we did, and you did not, you beg the question; for you know we pretend, that we separated only from that present Church, which had separated from *the doctrine of the ancients*, and because she had done so, *and so far forth as she had done so, 'and no farther.*—*Ibid.* Vol. II. pp. 376, 377.

LAUD, DOCTOR, ARCHBISHOP AND MARTYR.

B. 1573. D. 1645.

While the one faction [the Romanists] cries up the Church above the Scripture, and the other [the ultra-Protestants] the Scripture to the neglect and contempt of the Church, which the Scripture itself teaches men both to honour and obey, they have so far endangered the belief of the one and the authority of the other, as that neither hath its due from a great part of men. Whereas according to CHRIST'S institution, *the Scripture*, where 'tis plain, should guide the Church, and *the Church*, where there's doubt or difficulty, should expound the Scripture, yet so as neither the Scripture should be forced, nor the Church so bound up, as that upon just and farther evidence, she may not revise that which in any case hath slipped by her.—*Conference with Fisher.* Edit. 1639. *Dedication.*

That the Scripture where it is plain should guide the Church, and the Church where there is doubt or difficulty should expound the Scripture.

Fisher.—"And that the Scriptures only, not any unwritten tradition, was the foundation of their faith."

Bishop.—The Church of England grounded her *positive* articles upon Scripture, and her *negative* do refute there, where the thing affirmed by you is not affirmed by Scripture, nor directly to be concluded out of it. And here not the Church of England only, but all Protestants agree most truly and most strongly in this, that *the Scripture is sufficient to salvation, and contains in it all things necessary to it.* . . . And if the Scripture be the foundation to which we are to go for *witness*, if there be *doubt*, about the faith, and in which we are to find the thing that is to be believed as necessary to the faith; we never did, nor ever will refuse

On the sufficiency of Scripture.

The Interpretation of an universal Tradition never to be refuted.

any *tradition* that is universal and apostolic for the better *exposition* of the Scripture; nor any definition of the Church in which she goes to the Scripture for what she teaches, and thrusts nothing as *fundamental* in the faith upon the world, but what the Scripture fundamentally makes “*materiam credendorum*,” the substance of that which is so to be believed, whether immediately and expressly in words, or more remotely, till a full and clear deduction draw it out.

Against the beginning of this paragraph A. C. [Fisher's partisan] excepts. And first, he says (Num. 2. A. C. p. 48): “’Tis true that the Church of England grounded her positive articles upon Scripture; that is, ’tis true, *if themselves may be competent judges of their own cause.*”

The Anglican Church not a Judge of her own cause.

But this, by the leave of A. C. is true, *without making ourselves judges in our own cause.* For, that all the positive articles of the present Church of England are grounded upon Scripture, *we are content to be judged by the joint and constant belief of the Fathers which lived for five hundred years after CHRIST, when the Church was at the best; and by the councils held within those times; and to submit to them in all those points of doctrine.* Therefore we desire not to be judges in our own cause. And if any whom A. C. calls a novelist can truly say and maintain this, he will quickly prove himself *no* novelist. And for the *negative* articles, they refute where the thing affirmed by you is either not affirmed in Scripture, or not directly to be concluded out of it. Upon this negative ground A. C. infers again: “that the baptism of infants is not expressly (at least not evidently) affirmed in Scripture, nor directly (at least not demonstratively) concluded out of it.” In which case he “professes he would gladly know what can be answered to defend this doctrine to be a point of faith necessary for the salvation of infants.” And, in conclusion, “professes he cannot easily guess what answer can be made, unless we will acknowledge authority of Church tradition necessary in this case.” (A. C. p. 49.) And truly, since A. C. is so desirous of an answer, I will give it freely. And first, in the general, I am no way satisfied with A. C. his addition, “not expressly, at least not evidently.” What

means he? If he speak of the *letter* of the Scripture, then, whatsoever is “expressly” is “evidently” in the Scripture, and so his addition is vain. If he speak of the *meaning* of the Scripture, then his addition is cunning. For many things are “expressly” in Scripture, which yet in their *meaning* are not “evidently” there. And whatever he mean, my words are: “that our negative articles refute that which is not affirmed in Scripture,” without any addition of “expressly” or “evidently:” and he should have taken my words as I used them. I like nor change nor addition, nor am I bound to either, of A. C.’s making. And I am as little satisfied with his next addition, “nor directly, at least not demonstratively concluded out of it,” for are there not many things in good logic concluded “directly,” which yet are not concluded “demonstratively?” Surely there are. For to be directly or indirectly concluded, flows from the mode or form of the syllogism. To be “demonstratively” concluded, flows from the matter or nature of the propositions. If the propositions be prime and necessary truths, the syllogism is demonstrative and scientific, because the propositions are such. If the propositions be probable only, though the syllogism be made in the clearest mode, yet is the conclusion no more. The inference, or consequence, indeed, is clear and necessary, but the consequent is but probable or topical, as the propositions were. Now my words were only for a *direct conclusion*, and no more, though in this case I might give A. C. his caution. For Scripture here is the thing spoken of, and Scripture being a *principle*, and *every text* of Scripture confessedly a *principle* among all Christians, (whereof no man desires any farther proof,) I would fain know why that which is plainly and apparently, that is, by direct consequence, proved out of Scripture, is not “demonstratively” or scientifically proved? If at least he think there can be *any* demonstration in divinity; and if there can be none, why did he add “demonstratively?”

Next in particular, I answer to the instance which A. C. (Num. 4. A. C. p. 49) makes concerning the *baptism of infants*, that it may be concluded “directly,” (and let A. C.

That the baptism of infants may be concluded from Scripture.

judge, whether not “demonstratively”?) out of Scripture, both that infants ought to be baptized, and that baptism is necessary to their salvation. And first, that baptism is necessary to the salvation of infants (in the ordinary way of the Church, without binding God to the use and means of that sacrament to which He hath bound *us*) is express in St. John iii.—“Except a man be born again of water and the SPIRIT, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.” So no baptism no entrance. Nor can infants creep in, any other ordinary way. And this is the received opinion of all the ancient Church of CHRIST. And secondly, that infants ought to be baptized is first plain by evident and direct consequence out of Scripture; for if there be no salvation for infants in the *ordinary way* of the Church but by baptism, and this appear in Scripture, as it doth, then out of all doubt the consequence is most evident out of that Scripture, that infants are to be baptized that their salvation may be certain. For they which cannot help themselves must not be left only to extraordinary helps, of which we have no assurance, and for which we have no warrant at all in Scripture, while we in the mean time neglect the ordinary way and means commanded by CHRIST. Secondly, ’tis very near an expression in Scripture itself; for when St. Peter had ended that great sermon of his (Acts ii.), he applies two comforts unto them (ver. 38), “Amend your lives and be baptized, and you shall receive the gift of the HOLY GHOST.” And then (ver. 39) he infers, “for the promise is made to you, and to your children.” “The promise;” what promise? What? Why the promise of sanctification by the HOLY GHOST. By what means? Why, by Baptism. For ’tis expressly: “be baptized and ye shall receive,” and as expressly, “this promise is made to you *and to your children*.” And therefore A. C. may find it, if he will, *that the baptism of infants may be directly concluded out of Scripture*. For some of his own party, Ferus and Salmeron could both find it there. And so (if it will do him any pleasure) he hath my answer, which he saith he would be glad to know. ’Tis true, Bellarmine (lib. iv. De Verbo Dei, c. ix. § 5,) presses a main place out of St.

Augustine, and he urges it hard. St. Augustine's (Gen. ad Lit. c. xxiii.) words are: "The custom of our mother the Church in baptizing infants is by no means to be contemned, or thought superfluous, *nor yet at all to be believed, unless it were an apostolical tradition.*" The place is truly cited, but seems a great deal stronger than indeed it is. For first: 'tis not denied that this is an apostolical tradition, and *therefore* to be believed. But secondly: not therefore *only*. Nor doth St. Augustine say so, nor doth Bellarmine press it that way. . . . The truth is, it *would have been somewhat difficult* to find the collection out of Scripture *only* for the baptism of infants, since they do not *actually* believe, and therefore St. Augustine is at "nec credenda nisi," that this custom of the Church had not been to be believed, had it not been an *apostolical tradition*. But the tradition being apostolical, led on the Church easily to see the necessary deduction out of Scripture. And *this is not the least use* of Tradition, *to lead the Church into the true meaning of those things which are found in Scripture, though not obvious to every eye there.* And that this is St. Augustine's meaning, is manifest by himself, who best knew it. For when he had said, (Ser. viii. de Ver. Apos. c. 8; Ser. x. c. 2,) as he doth, that to baptize children is "*antiqua fidei regula,*" the ancient rule of faith, and the constant tenet of the Church, yet he doubts not to collect and deduce it out of Scripture also. For when Pelagius urged that infants needed not to be baptized, because they had no original sin, St. Augustine relies not upon the tenet of the Church only, but argues from the text thus: What need have infants of CHRIST if they be not sick? for "the sound need not a physician." (St. Matt. ix. 12.) And again, is not this said by Pelagius, "*ut non accedant ad Jesum?*" That infants may not come to their SAVIOUR? "*Sed clamat JESUS,*" but JESUS cries out, "Suffer little ones to come unto me." (St. Mark x. 14.) And all this is fully acknowledged by Calvin, (4 Inst. c. xvi. § 8,) namely, that "all men acknowledge the baptism of infants to descend from apostolical tradition," and yet that (4 Inst. c. viii. § 16,) "it doth not depend upon the bare and naked authority of

the Church." Which he speaks not in regard of Tradition, but in relation to such proof as is to be made by *necessary consequence out of Scripture over and above* Tradition. As for Tradition, I have said enough for that, and as much as A. C. where 'tis *truly apostolical*. And yet if any thing will please him, I will add this concerning this particular, the baptizing of infants—that the Church received this by Tradition from the Apostles. By *Tradition*, and what then? May it not directly be concluded out of Scripture, because it was delivered to the Church by way of tradition? I hope A. C. will never say so. For certainly in *doctrinal* things, nothing so likely to be a tradition apostolical as that which hath a *root* and a *foundation* in Scripture. For Apostles cannot write or deliver *contrary*, but subordinate and subservient things.—*Conference with Fisher*, pp. 52—59.

The Catholic
Church in-
fallible in
funda-
mentals.

That the whole Church cannot universally err in the doctrine of faith is most true, and 'tis granted by divers Protestants, so you will but understand it's not erring in *absolute fundamental* doctrines And that the whole Church cannot err in doctrines absolutely fundamental and necessary to all men's salvation (besides the authority of these Protestants, most of them being of prime rank) seems to me to be clear by the promise of CHRIST: (St. Matt. xvi. 18,) that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Whereas most certain it is, that the "gates of hell" prevail very far against it if the whole militant Church, universally taken, can err *from* or *in* the foundation. But then this power of not erring, is not to be conceived as if it were in the Church *primo et per se*, originally, or by any power it hath of itself: for the Church is constituted of men, and "humanum est errare," all men can err. But this power is in it, partly by the virtue of this promise of CHRIST, and partly by the matter which it teacheth, which is the unerring Word of God, so plainly and manifestly delivered to her as that it is not possible she should universally fall from it, or teach against it, in things absolutely necessary to salvation. Besides, it would be well weighed, whether to believe or teach otherwise,

will not impeach the article of the Creed concerning the holy Catholic Church, which we profess we believe. For the holy Catholic Church there spoken of, contains not only the whole militant Church on earth, but the whole triumphant also in heaven. For so St. Augustine (Enchir. c. lvi.), hath long since taught me. Now if the whole Catholic Church, in this large extent, be holy, then certainly the whole *militant* Church is holy as well as the triumphant, though in a far lower degree, inasmuch as all sanctification ("Nemo ex toto sanctus," Optat. lib. vii. contra Parmen.) all holiness is imperfect in this life, as well in *Churches* as in men. *Holy* then the whole militant Church is, for that which the Apostle speaks of Abraham, is true of the Church, which is a body collective, *made up of the spiritual seed of Abraham*. (Rom. ii. 16.) "If the root be holy, so are the branches." Well then, the whole militant Church is holy, and so we believe. Why, but will it not follow then that the *whole* militant Church cannot possibly err in the *foundations* of the faith? That she may err in *superstructures* and *deductions*, and other by and unnecessary truths if her curiosity or other weakness carry her beyond or cause her to fall short of her rule, no doubt need be made. But if she can err either *from* the foundation or *in* it, she can be no longer *holy*, and that article of the Creed is gone. For if she can err quite from the foundation, then is she not holy nor Church, but becomes infidel. Now this cannot be, for all divines, ancient and modern, Romanists and Reformers, agree in this, that the whole militant Church of CHRIST cannot fall away into general apostasy. And if she err in the foundation, that is, in some one or more fundamental points of faith, then she may be a Church of CHRIST still, but not holy, because heretical, and most certain it is, that no assembly, (be it never so general,) of such heretics, is, or can be, holy. (St. Hierom. in Jerom. 10.) Other errors that are of a meaner allay take not holiness from the Church, but these that are dyed in grain cannot consist with holiness, of which faith in CHRIST is the very foundation: and therefore, if we will keep up our Creed, the whole militant

Church must be still holy. For if it be not so *still*, then there may be a time that “*falsum*” may “*subesse Fidei Catholicæ*,” that falsehood, and that in a high degree in the very article, may be the subject of the Catholic faith, which were no less than blasphemy to affirm. For we must still believe the “Holy Catholic Church.” And if she be not *still* holy, then at that time when she is not so, we believe a falsehood under the article of the Catholic faith. Therefore a very dangerous thing it is to cry out in general terms, that *the whole Catholic militant Church can err*, and not limit nor distinguish in time; that it can err indeed, for *ignorance* it hath, and ignorance can err. But err it cannot, either by falling totally from the foundation, or by *heretical* error in it. For the holiness of the Church consists as much, if not more, in the *verity of the faith*, as in the *integrity of manners* taught and commanded in the doctrine of faith.—*Conference with Fisher*, pp. 139—142.

The Catholic Church infallible in fundamentals.

In this troublesome and quarrelling age, I am most unwilling to meddle with the erring of the Church in general. The Church of England is content to pass that over. And though she tells us (Art. 19,) that “the Church of Rome hath erred even in matters of faith,” yet of the erring of the Church in general she is modestly silent. But since A. C. will needs have it, that the whole Church did never generally err in *any one* point of faith, he should do well to distinguish, before he be so peremptory. For if he mean no more than that the whole universal Church of CHRIST cannot universally err in any one point of faith, *simply necessary to all men’s salvation*, he fights with no adversary that I know, but his own fiction, for the most learned Protestants grant it.—*Ibid.* pp. 160, 161.

Scripture and Tradition ought to go together.

When the Fathers say we are to rely upon Scripture *only*, they are never to be understood with exclusion of tradition in what causes soever it may be had. Not but that the Scripture is abundantly sufficient in, and to itself, for all things, but because it is deep and may be drawn into different senses, and so mistaken, *if any man will presume*

upon his own strength and go single without the Church.—
Ibid. p. 104.

A Council hath power to order, settle, and define differences arisen concerning faith. This power the Council hath not by any immediate institution from CHRIST, but it was prudently taken up in the Church from the Apostles' example (Acts xv.), so that to hold Councils to this end, is apparent apostolical tradition written. But the power which Councils so held have, is from the whole Catholic Church, whose members they are, and the Church's power from God. And this power the Church cannot farther give away to a General Council, than that the decrees of it shall bind all particulars and itself, but not bind the whole Church from calling again, and in the after calls, upon *just cause*, to order, yea, and if need be, to abrogate former acts. I say upon *just cause*. For if the Council be *lawfully called* and *proceed orderly*, and *conclude according to the rule*—the Scripture, *the whole Church cannot but approve* the Council, and then *the definitions of it are binding*. And the power of the Church hath no wrong in this, so long as no power but her own may meddle or offer to infringe any definition of her's made in her representative body, a lawful General Council. And certain it is, no power but her own may do it. *Nor doth this open any gap to private spirits*: for all decisions in such a Council, are binding: and because the whole Church can meet no other way, *the Council shall remain the supreme, external, living, temporary ecclesiastical judge of all controversies*. Only the whole Church, and she *alone* hath power when Scripture or demonstration is found and peaceably tendered to her, to represent herself again in a new Council, and in it, to order what was amiss.—*Ibid.* pp. 261, 262.

We believe all the articles of the Christian faith. . . . *Ibid.*
 because they are revealed from and by God, and sufficiently applied in His word, and by His Church's ministration. . . . Nor do we believe any one article of faith by our own fancy, or by fallible authority of human deduc-

General
Councils
when in-
fallible.

tions, but next to the infallible authority of God's Word *we are guided by His Church*. But then A. C. (p. 71,) steps into a conclusion whither we cannot follow him. For he says "that the articles to be believed must be sufficiently made known to us by the infallible authority of the Church of God, that is, of men infallibly assisted by the SPIRIT of GOD, as all lawfully called, continued and confirmed General Councils are assisted." That the *whole* Church of GOD is infallibly assisted by the SPIRIT of GOD, so that it cannot by any error fall away totally from CHRIST the foundation, I make no doubt. For if it could, [then] the gates of hell had prevailed against it, which our SAVIOUR assures me, (St. Matt. xvii. 18,) they shall never be able to do. But that all General Councils, be they never so lawfully called, continued, and confirmed, have infallible assistance, I utterly deny. 'Tis true that a General Council *de post facto*, after 'tis ended *and admitted by the whole Church*, is THEN *infallible*, for it cannot err in that which it hath already clearly and truly determined without error. But that a General Council *à parte ante*, when it first sits down and continues to deliberate, may truly be said to be infallible in all its after deliberations whatsoever they shall be, I utterly deny.—*Conference with Fisher*, pp. 344, 345, 346.

If any General Council do now err, either it errs in things absolutely necessary to salvation, or in things not necessary. If it err in things *necessary*, we can be *infallibly* assured by *the Scriptures, the Creeds, the four first General Councils, and the whole Church*, where it errs in one and not in another. If it be "in *non-necessariis*," in things *not* necessary, 'tis not requisite that we should have for them an infallible assurance.—*Ibid.* p. 358.

PRIDEAUX, BISHOP.

B. 1578. D. 1650.

Tradition.

Tradition may be taken either 1. Actively, or 2. Passively. Actively to signify delivery or transmission—thus, Books come to our hands by tradition, or delivery from the ancients. . . . Passively it applies to Doctrine,

what may be delivered to us by *Oral Tradition* or by *Written Tradition*, or by both the one and the other. The only controversy is how far unwritten tradition is to be received as evidence for the establishment of *Doctrine*.

Again, Tradition may be either—

1. Historical, when it informs us of the rites, discipline, or customs of the Church;

Or, 2. Exegetical, *when it explains in what sense obscure and controverted portions of Scripture were generally received by the Primitive Church*;

Or, 3. Didactic, when it interweaves, so to speak, the interpretations of men with the undoubted text of sacred Scripture, *to supply its deficiency in certain articles necessary to salvation*.

They are *only* the traditions foisted on us under this *third* character which we reject and withstand.¹—Translated from *Fasciculus Controversiarum. De Scriptura*, pp. 49, 50. Edit. 1664.

CHARLES, KING AND MARTYR.

B. 1600. D. 1648.

If *the practice of the Primitive Church*, and the *universal consent of the Fathers*, be not a convincing argument, when the interpretation of Scripture is doubtful, I know nothing; for, if this be not, then of necessity the interpretation of private spirits must be admitted: the which contradicts St. Peter, (2 Pet. i. 20,) is the mother of all sects, and will (if not prevented) bring these kingdoms into confusion: and to say, that an argument is ill, because the Papists use it, or, that such a thing is good, because it is the custom of some of the Reformed Churches, cannot weigh with me, until you prove these to be *infallible* or that to contain *no truth*.
—*Second Paper to Mr. Henderson.*—*Reliquiæ sacræ Carolinæ. Hague. P. 323.*

Holy Scripture should be interpreted by the universal consent of Fathers.

¹ The above testimony is the more valuable from the circumstance that Prideaux has been sometimes represented as holding Anti-Catholic opinions with regard to Tradition.

Holy Scripture should be interpreted by the universal consent of Fathers.

When you and I differ upon the interpretation of Scripture, and I appeal to *the practice of the Primitive Church*, and the *universal consent of the Fathers*, to be a judge between us, methinks you should either find a fitter, or submit to what I offer; neither of which (to my understanding) you have yet done; nor have you shown how, waiving those judges I appeal unto, the mischief of the interpretation of private spirits can be prevented.—*Third Paper. Ibid. pp. 341, 342.*

Ibid.

My conclusion is, that albeit *I never esteemed any authority equal to the Scriptures*, yet I do think the *unanimous consent of Fathers*, and the *universal practice of the Primitive Church*, to be the best and most authentical interpreters of GOD's word, and consequently the fittest Judges between me and you, when we differ, until you shall find me a better.—*Fifth Paper. Ibid. p. 355.*¹

HALL, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.

B. 1574. D. 1656.

That the Anglican Church is Catholic in doctrine.

Let frantic error bawl what it list, we are Christians, we are Catholics, the undivided members of one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. Let us meet at this bar if you please, let who will maintain the plea. What is it which maketh a Church? What is it which maketh that Church One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic? Is it not one Holy, Catholic, Apostolical Faith? But what is that? Is it not the same which was delivered by CHRIST and the Apostles to the whole world, *and was always and everywhere approved through all ages*, even unto our own times? Wherefore are the Scriptures, wherefore are the *Creeds*, wherefore were the *Primitive Councils*, but that there might be *certain marks* whereby *Catholics might be undoubtedly discerned from heretics*? You know the epilogue of the Athanasian Creed, "This is the Catholic Faith." If we

¹ No apology will be requisite to Churchmen, for the introduction of the testimony of Charles I. among those of the "Doctors and Masters" of the Anglican Church. It would be well if all parties were better acquainted with his writings.

may believe Leo, the heads of all heresies are quite cut off with this one sword of the Creed, how much more then with that two-edged sword of the Scriptures, *and that of the Fathers their interpreters?* What then? Those that then were Catholics, can they in any age be condemned for heretics? No. Faith is always constant to itself, and so is the Church that is built upon that faith. Did we ever deny or make doubt of any article or clause of that ancient divinity? Either then CHRIST himself, the Apostles, Councils, Fathers erred from the Catholic faith, or we yet remain Catholics. Whatever other opinions we meet withal, concerning religion, neither make nor mar it. Say they be false, say they be vicious, they are but hay and stubble which nothing appertain to the foundation of this everlasting frame. The Church may be either more sound or more corrupt for them, it cannot be more or less a Church. The beauty or deformity of a Church may consist in them, the strength, the welfare of it doth not. Surely, whosoever willingly subscribes to the Word of GOD signed in the everlasting monuments of Scripture, to the ancient Creeds, to the four General Councils, to the common consent of the Fathers for six hundred years after CHRIST, *which we of the Reformed Church religiously profess to do;* if he may err in small points, yet he cannot be an heretic. Some particular Church may easily offend by imputing heresy to an undeserved opinion, whether perhaps true or lightly erroneous; but neither soul nor Church can greatly err *while it treads in the steps of the most ancient and universal.* —*Sermon on 1 Cor. c. xii. v. 4.—Works, Fol. 1647. pp. 517, 518.*

BIRCKBECK, PRIEST.

B. 1584. D. 1656.

Vincentius Lirinensis saith that “the Canon or Rule of faith is perfect; abundantly sufficient in itself for all things, yea, more than sufficient.” Neither is this a false supposal, as a Jesuit pretends it to be, but a grounded truth and the author’s doctrine. Lirinensis, indeed, maketh first one general sufficient rule for all things—the *Sacred Scriptures*. Of Scripture
and Tra-
dition.

Secondly, *another*, useful in some cases only, yet never to be used in those cases without Scriptures, which is *the Tradition of the universal Church, and general consent of Fathers*.

The first was used by the ancient Church from the worth that is in itself; the other is used *to avoid the jarring interpretations of perverse heretics* that many times abuse the sacred rule and standard of the Scripture. Now, we admit the Church's interpretation as ministerial to Scripture, so it be conformable thereunto. And we say,
 "Bring us now one Scripture, expounded (according to Lirinensis, his rule,) by the universal consent of the Primitive Church, to prove prayer to Saints, image worship in your sense, and we will receive it."—*The Protestant's Evidence, &c.*—Fol. 1656. pp. 155, 156.

MORTON, BISHOP.

B. 1564. D. 1659.

Of the
Creeds and
General
Councils.

I do therefore here solemnly profess, in the presence of Almighty God, that by His grace preventing and assisting me, I have always lived, and purpose to die, in the true Catholic Faith wherein I was baptized; firmly believing all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and fully assenting to every article of all those three creeds, (commonly called the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene or Constantinopolitan Creed, and the Athanasian Creed,) which in the Ancient Church were accounted the adequate rules of faith, and have accordingly been received as such, by the Church of England. As for Councils, that are free and generally consisting of competent persons, lawfully summoned, and proceeding according to the Word of God, such as were the four first, viz. those of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, I do reverence them as the supreme tribunals of the Church of CHRIST upon earth, for judging heresies, and composing differences in the Church. And as I utterly condemn all heresies that have been condemned by any of them, so I heartily wish that all the present differences in the Church of God might be deter-

mined by such a free General Council, as any of those four were already mentioned.—*Last Will*.¹

HAMMOND, DOCTOR AND CONFESSOR.

B. 1605. D. 1660.

§ III. 1. This then being the adequate object of the Christian's faith, those verities which have been revealed to us by GOD to be thus believed to righteousness, called therefore *ὕγιαίνοντες λόγοι*, words not only true but wholesome, the belief whereof is required in order to our souls' health; the next inquiry is, how we that live in the same distance from CHRIST and His Apostles in respect of time, that we are situate from heaven, which now contains CHRIST, in respect of place, may come within the reach of these revelations of CHRIST, or to any competent undoubted assurance, that those are such indeed, which are pretended to be so.

2. And to this also my concession shall be as liberal as any Romanist can wish, that there are *two* (Basil. de Spir. Sanct. c. xxvii.) ways of conveying such revelations to us; one in writing, the other by oral tradition; the former in the Gospels and other writings of the Apostles, &c. which makes up the Sacred Writ, or Canon of the New Testament; the latter in the Apostles' preaching to all the churches of their plantations, which are nowhere set down for us in the Sacred Writ, but conserved as *Deposita* (1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 14,) by them to whom they were entrusted.

The two ways of conveying the faith to us.

3. And although in sundry respects the former of these be much the more faithful, steady way of conveyance, and for want thereof many things may possibly have perished, or been changed by their passage through many hands, thus much being on these grounds confessed by Bellarmine himself, (de Verbo Dei, lib. i. c. 2,) that the Scripture is the most certain and safe rule of belief; yet there being no less veracity in the tongues than the hands, in the preachings than the writings of the Apostles; nay, "Prior sermo quam

¹ See Catena Patrum. No. III. p. 12.

liber, prior sensus quam stylus," saith Tertullian, the Apostles preached before they writ, planted churches before they addressed Epistles to them: on these grounds I make no scruple to grant that Apostolical traditions, such as are truly so, as well as Apostolical writings, *are equally the matter of a Christian's belief; who is equally secured by the fidelity of the conveyance, that as one is Apostolical writing, so the other is Apostolical Tradition.*

The testimony upon which we receive the faith.

§ IV. 1. Next then the inquiry must proceed by examining what is this equal way of conveyance, common to both these, upon strength of which we become obliged to receive such or such a tradition for Apostolical.

2. And this again is acknowledged not to be any Divine testimony; for God hath nowhere affirmed in Divine Writ, that the Epistle, inscribed of Paul the Apostle to the Romans, consisting of so many periods as now it is in our Bibles, was ever written by that Apostle, nor are there any inward characters or signatures, or beams of light in the writing itself, that can be admitted, or pretended for testimonies of this, any more than the like may exact to be admitted as witnesses, that the Creed called the Apostles', was indeed, in the full sense of it, delivered to the Churches.

3. It remains then, that herein on both sides we rest content with human testimonies of undoubted authority, or such as there is not any rational motive to distrust, and of which alone the matter is capable. For as in case of question concerning the Epistle to the Romans, whether this be it, which was addressed by St. Paul to that Church, the only regular way of satisfying the question, is, 1st, By devolution or appeal to the authority of those Fathers and Councils, to whom it was *de facto* sufficiently testified and approved, (viz. by examination of the records of that Church to whom it was written, and by whom received, through the hands of some trusty messenger of that Apostle, such as Phœbe that ministered unto him, and by other creditable ways of confirmation) and 2dly, and by that consequence, to those very original records and proofs of undoubted fidelity: so the way of trial of any tradition, pretended to be Apostolical, whether it be such or no, is by devolving it to those

same, or the like Fathers and Councils, which having occasion and commodity to examine the truth of the matter by the records or testimonies of those Churches, to which it was delivered, found it sufficiently testified by them, that it was in truth according as is pretended.

4. And from hence it follows, that as we of this age have no other way of judging of the Canon of Scripture, or of any Book, or chapter, or period contained in it, but by the affirmation and authority of those testifiers in the first ages of the Church, either by their writings, or by the unquestioned relations of others, brought down and made known to us; so are we as unable to judge of Apostolical traditions unwritten, whether this or that doctrine be such or no, unless it be thus by the undoubted affirmations of the ancients (who are presumable by their antiquity to know the truth, and by their uniform consent, neither to mistake themselves, nor to deceive us;) communicated and conveyed to us.

5. 'Tis not possible for any man or men of the greatest understandings or integrity, to see or know what is not done within the reach of their faculties, unless either they be inspired by God, or otherwise informed either mediately or immediately from those, who had really knowledge of it. Stories of former times are not wont to be written by the strength of men's natural parts, invention, or judgment, but only by consulting of those records, either dead or living, by whose help such matters of fact have been preserved. Every thing else is but conjecture, and that very uncertain, the utmost probability in such matters being little worth, that being oftentimes done which really was (and much more to us, who know not the motives of actions far removed from us, is) of all things least probable to have been done. Only a creditable witness, such as no prudent man hath reason to distrust either as nescient or false, is worth considering, or able to found belief in this matter.

§ V. 1. Now then comes the upshot of the inquiry, what *qualifications* there are of a testimony or a testifier, without which, it or he may not be thus deemed creditable, or *ἀξιόπιστος* worthy to be believed by a sober Christian; and where these qualifications are to be found, which when we

The qualifications of such testimonies.

have once resolved, it will also be possible for us to pass some judgment of traditions duly styled Apostolical, which as such must be allowed to be the object of our faith.

2. And herein I shall hope also that the resolution will be unquestionable, if it be bounded by those three terms, to which Vicentius Lirinensis (Cont. Hær. cap. iii.), in his defence of the Catholic Faith against Heresies and innovations hath directed us, *Universitas, Antiquitas, Consensio*, Universality, Antiquity, Consent, viz. That the testimony we depend on, be the result of all the ancients, consenting, or without any considerable dissent. Or, in yet fewer words, a Catholic testimony, truly such, *i. e.* universal in all respects; (1) of place, (2) of time, (3) of persons.

3. For first, if it be not testified from all places, it is not qualified for our belief, as Catholic in respect of *place*, because the faith being *one* and the *same*, and by all and every of the Apostles preached, and deposited in *all* their plantations, what was ever really thus taught, by *any* of them in any Church, will also be found to have been taught, and received in *all* other Apostolical Churches.

4. To which purpose the words of Irenæus are express, lib. i. cap. 3. “The Church disseminated over all the world, having received this preaching and this faith, preserves it diligently, as the inhabitants of the same house believe them alike as having the same soul and heart, and teach, and preach, and deliver them alike, as having the same mouth; for though their languages are unlike, the virtue of Tradition is one and the same, and neither do the Churches which are founded in Germany believe or deliver otherwise than those which were constituted in Spain, in France, in the Orient, in Egypt, in Afric, in the middle of the world; but as one and the same sun shines through the whole world, so doth the light and preaching of the truth in every place, where it is received, disperse itself.”

5. So also Tertullian de Præscript. c. xx. “Presently, therefore, the Apostles having first in Judea testified the faith and instituted Churches, and then taken their journey over all the world, made known to the nations the same doctrine of the same faith, and so planted Churches in every city,

from which the rest of the Churches afterward borrowed their seeds of faith and doctrine, and so daily continue to do, and are formed into Churches."

6. From which premises his conclusion is just that which I here deduce; "if so, then it is evident that every doctrine must be deemed true which conspires with the Apostolical Churches, which are the wombs and originals whence the faith came out, as maintaining that without any question, which the Churches received from the Apostles, the Apostles from CHRIST, and CHRIST from GOD; and that all other doctrine is under the prejudice of being false, which is contrary to the truth of the Churches of the Apostles, of CHRIST, and of GOD."

7. 'Tis true, indeed, that whatsoever one Church professeth to have received from the Apostle that planted it, is of itself sufficient, without the confirmation of all others, to beget and establish belief in him, to whom it thus testifies: whereupon Tertullian (De Præscr. cap. xxxvi.) refers the inquirer to that Apostolic Church which is next to him, be it Corinth, if he live in Achaia, Philippi, or Thessalonica: if in Macedonia, Ephesus: if in Asia, or if he be near Italy, Rome. But this is no farther to be extended, than while we suppose without inquiry, that other Apostolical Churches have received, and are ready to testify the same; which presumption or supposal must then cease, when upon inquiry we find the contrary; there being then none of this first kind of universality; viz. of *place*, and so far, no validity in the testification.

8. Secondly, for the universality of *time*, that must be cautiously understood: not so as to signify it a prejudice to any doctrine, if in some one or more ages it have not been universally received; for then there could be no Heretics at any time in the world: but so as to extend to the *first and purest*, and not only to the latter ages of the Church.

9. That which was delivered by the Apostles was certainly received in that first age, wherein they lived: and by careful inquiry will be found from their monuments to have been among them. And that which by this trial is discerned to be of latter date, not to be descried in the first

times, nor testified by sufficient authority to be derived from thence, falls short again of this second part of universality in respect of time.

10. Thirdly, for the *consent of testifiers*, that it is also necessary to the rendering it a Catholic and authentic testimony; any considerable number of dissenters being of necessity to weaken our belief, and infuse reasons of doubting, and a preponderancy of dissenters the other way, to weigh down (at least to *incline*) the belief to the contrary.

Where these
qualifica-
tions may
be found.

§ VI. 1. This, therefore, being thus established, and the conjunction of all the three sorts of universality being in all reason required to the authentic testifying of Tradition, it is soon defined, where these qualifications are to be looked for, and where they may be found.

2. Questionless not in any one Bishop, or succession of Bishops in any See for many latter ages, not including the Apostles; for whatever his pretensions may be to authority and supremacy over all other Churches, this can never convert a particular, whether man or Church, into the universal, nor make his testimony authentic according to those rational and Christian rules, which we have learned from Lirinensis.

3. There are many Apostolic Churches beside that of Rome: great difference of Rome in these latter ages from the Primitive Apostolic Rome, to which the *Depositum* was entrusted. And there are many dissenters to be found, who have always lived and flourished in the Catholic Church, which never acknowledged those doctrines to be delivered to them by the Apostles, which the Church of Rome hath of late assumed to be such. And for any privilege annexed to that Bishop's chair, or to that society of men which live in external communion with him, that he or they can never define any thing to be (*de fide*) part of the faith, which is not so, as that is beyond all other their pretensions, most denied by us, and least attempted to be proved by the Romanist, and not so much as consented on among themselves; so must it in no reason be supposed in this dispute, or taken for granted by them, but is rejected with the same ease that it is mentioned by them.

4. As for other pretenders, I know not any, save only ^{The Consent of Doctors.} that of the universal consent of the Doctors of the first ages, or that of an universal Council. And both these we are willing to admit with such cautions only as the matter exacts, and the grounds of defining already laid.

5. The *universal consent* of the Doctors of the *first ages*, bearing testimony that such or such a doctrine was from the Apostles' preachings delivered to all Churches by them planted, or their general *conform testimony herein*, without any considerable dissenters producible, is, I acknowledge, ἀξιόπιστος, authentic or worthy of belief, and so hath been made use of by the orthodox of all times, as sufficient for the rejecting of any new doctrine.

6. So likewise is the declaration of a General Council, ^{Definitions of Councils truly general.} *free and gathered from all quarters*, and in such other respects, truly so called, *founded in the examination of the monuments of the several Apostolical plantations*, either produced in Council, or authentically confirmed from the letters of the several Churches, either formerly prepared in provincial and national Councils, or otherwise sufficiently confirmed to them, and this declaration *conciliarly promulgated*, and after the promulgation *universally received and accepted* by the Church diffusive; or else it is evident all this while, that it is not a Catholic (truly so styled) testimony.

7. For that any Council of Bishops, the most numerous that ever was in the world (much less a but *major* part of those *few* that be there present) is not yet really the universality of Christians, is too evident to be doubted of.

8. It can only then be pretended, that it is the universal representative, or such an assembly, wherein is contained the virtue and influences of the whole universal Church. And thus, indeed, I suppose it to be, as often as the doctrines there established by *universal consent* (founded in Scripture and Tradition) have either been before discussed and resolved in each provincial Council, which have sent their delegates thither from *all* the parts of the world, or else have *post factum*, after the promulgation, been accepted

by them, and acknowledged to agree with that faith which they had originally received.

15. When a doctrine is conciliarly agreed on, it is then promulgated to all; and the *universal* though but tacit approbation and reception thereof, the no considerable contradiction given to it in the Church, is a competent evidence that this is the judgment and concordant Tradition of the whole Church, though no such resolution of provincial synods have preceded.

16. But if that be also wanting, if the sentence of a *major* part of bishops in a Council be not (when it comes to be declared in the world) admitted or received in the Church, as consonant to the doctrine of the Apostles, written or unwritten; if the grounds whereon it hath been by the Council defined (for so the suffrages are conciliarly to be delivered, together with their grounds and reasons of them, out of Scripture or Tradition) be by others which sat not in that Council, found to be false or vain, and are as such contradicted and protested against; this evidently prejudiceth the authority of that Council, and shows their incompetency for the work (in hand) of universal testification.

17. On which grounds it is, that St. Hilary in his tract of Synods against the Arians (p. 220), setting down all the creeds, which after the Nicene Creed had been set out in several times and places, desires all the Bishops of France and Britain, &c. to whom he writes, to give their judgment whether they be Catholic or heretical.

The benefit
from Gene-
ral Councils.

§ VII. I. From these premises thus briefly deduced, it now appears, 1. What is that we owe to the Councils of the Church; I shall most safely express it in the words of Vincentius, (c. xxiii.) “What hath the Church ever brought forth by the decrees of Councils, save only that which was before simply believed, the same should after be believed more diligently; what was before less vigorously preached, that same should after be preached more instantly; what was before more securely observed, that same should after be more solicitously dressed or cultivated? This, I say, and nothing but this, hath the Catholic Church, stirred up

by heretics' new doctrines, done by the decrees of Councils; what before it had received from the ancestors by Tradition only, it hath after committed to writing, and as an obligation under its own hand consigned to posterity."

2. In a word, that which was before the constant belief of the whole Church received from the Apostles' times and preaching, and by conciliar discussions and search found to be so, is thus delivered down to us by those Councils, and testified by them to be that which they found in the Church universally. This, I suppose, the meaning of the ἀνακρινέτωσαν ἀλλήλοις τὰ δόγματα τῆς εὐσεβείας, in the thirty-seventh Apostolic canon; let them in their Councils *discuss and examine the doctrines of piety*, inquire and discern what have been *delivered* to them as such, and then τὰς ἐμπιπτούσας ἐκκλησιαστικὰς ἀντιλογίας διαλύετωσαν, let them answer or satisfy the incidental objections which shall happen to be made to them in the Church. And so no new doctrine ever received from their authority or power of defining, but the ancient Apostolic Catholic doctrine testified to us.

3. Secondly, it is hence manifest also, what is the ground of that reverence that is by all sober Christians deemed due and paid to the four first General Councils, which Vincentius looks on as the great *Conservatories of Tradition*, wherein he might fitly instance, and which Pope Gregory the Great professeth to believe, as he doth, the four Gospels (lib. i. epist. 24); and Theodosius Cenobiarcha, so much commended by Cyril and others, anathematizeth all who are not of that opinion, viz. because, 1. as Theodoret, Hist. lib. i. c. 8, out of Athanasius, declares of the Nicene, that they set down and convinced the truths of their doctrine, "out of the Scripture words understood with piety," *i. e.* so as the pious orthodox Fathers had always understood them, "not inventing words or phrases for themselves, but having testimony from the Fathers" for what they wrote, (for, saith he, the bishops of Rome and Alexandria for almost a hundred and thirty years had found fault with them, who affirmed the SON to be ποίημα, "a creature," καὶ μὴ ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ, and "not of the same substance

Reverence
due to General Councils,
and to the
first four
especially.

with the FATHER,") so it was true of all the other three; they fetched their definitions regularly from that Scripture, and that sense thereof, which the several Churches had received down from the Apostles, and so were approved and received universally in all Churches, not as those which had formed any new articles, but which conserved the *Deposita* entrusted to the Churches, and in time of need brought them forth and discovered them, to the securing of the truth against heretics.

4. Secondly, because these being so near the Apostles' times, and gathered as soon as the heterodox opinions appeared, the sense of the Apostles might more easily be fetched from those men and Churches to whom they had committed it, and it was not in the power of subtlety and craft to infuse their poison undiscernibly into those fountains. This account is also given by Lirinensis, where speaking of the way of confuting heretics, (c. xxxix.) by producing and comparing the concordant doctrines of the old Fathers, he puts in this among other cautions, "All heresies are not always thus to be impugned, but only those that are fresh risen, and have not yet had time to vitiate the volumes of the Fathers, or falsify the rules of the ancient faith:" wisely foreseeing that in this case there is no course of dealing with, or convincing of heretics, unless it be either by the sole authority of Scripture, or by the Councils of Catholics, which were long ago universal.

6. Thirdly, some consideration may also be had of the special matter of the definitions of those four Councils, which were all spent upon the Deity and incarnation of CHRIST, and the TRINITY, and the great *fundamental doctrines of Christianity*; and to that also Vincentius directs us, in another caution of his: "The ancient consent of the holy Fathers is not to be sought and followed in all the little questions of the Divine law, but only, sure principally, in the rule of faith," those which the Apostles thought necessary to be believed, and so taught them universally.

7. And therefore of the Scriptures, of the Creed, (that "regula fidei una, sola immobilis et irreformabilis,—that

one, only immovable and unreformable rule of faith," as Tertullian calls it, *De vel. Vir. c. i.*) and of those *four Councils* as the *Repositories of all true Apostolical Tradition*, I suppose it very regular to affirm, that the entire body of the Catholic faith is to be established, and all heresies convinced, or else that there is no just reason that any doctrine should be condemned as such.

§ IX. Though I make it no matter of faith, because delivered neither by Scripture nor Apostolic Tradition, yet I shall number it among the "*pie credibilia*," that no General Council, truly such, duly assembled; 2, freely celebrated; and 3, universally received; either *hath erred*, or ever *shall err* in matters of faith.

A true General Council is indefectible.

And for the fifth General Council, it being, for the *doctrinal* part of it, but a *corroboration* of the fourth, our Church makes no more doubt of that than of the fourth it doth. Only after the example of Vincentius Lirinensis, that famous propugnator of the Catholic faith against all heresies, and by strength of the premised Ephesine canon, we believe the four first Councils to be *the Conservatories of all truly Catholic, i. e. Apostolic Tradition*, from whence *together with the Scripture*, all heresies may be oppugned and confuted, and so have no such need of, or benefit from this fifth, as from the former four Councils.

The fifth General Council.

§ XV. 1. 'Tis time now to draw to a conclusion of this whole matter; and from the premises to complete and abbreviate that plea, which will, I doubt not, secure the Church of England from all colourable charge of heresy. For that,

Summary of the judgment of the Anglican Church respecting Scripture and tradition.

2. First, It confessedly receives the *whole* word of CHRIST, the entire Canon of the New Testament.

3. Secondly, It retains entire the Symbol of the Apostolic faith, as that was delivered to the churches in all the Apostolic plantations.

4. Thirdly, It understands both Scripture and Creed, according to that *traditive interpretation*, which the first four, or if you will, six, or indeed any of the Œcumenical Councils, truly so called, have discovered and declared to be the sense of all the Apostolic Churches in the world, and were

universally received by all Churches in such their declaration.

5. Fourthly, That we never rejected any Catholic Testimony (offered in behalf of any doctrine) nor Council, but such as even our enemies grant, or evidence of the matter proclaims, not to have been Œcumenical.

6. Fifthly, That we do not believe that any General Council, *truly such*, ever did, or shall err in any matter of faith, nor shall we farther dispute the authority, when we shall be duly satisfied of the *universality* of any such.

7. Lastly, That we are willing to proceed, and enlarge all this, from the Church collected in Council to the Church diffused, or the principal Pastors thereof, out of Council; and are ready to receive and acknowledge as doctrine of faith every proposition which the Fathers that lived in any competent distance from the Apostles, do *uniformly*, or without any considerable dissent, deliver down to us, as the truths of GOD.—Traditions Apostolical.—*Of Heresy. Works*, Fol. 1674. Vol. I. p. 387—406.

HEYLIN, PRIEST AND CONFESSOR.

B. 1600. D. 1662.

Of the
authority of
the Fathers.

The holy Scriptures are the main foundation which I am to build on, (in the exposition of the Creed) according to that sense and interpretation which have been given us of them by the holy Fathers, and other Catholic Doctors of the Church of CHRIST, who lived before the truth degenerated into popish dotages; and whose authorities and judgments I conceive most fit for the determining of such controversies which are now on foot, as being like to prove most indifferent umpires, because not any way engaged in our present quarrels. I know that Downe, Dalie, and others of great parts and wit have laboured to disclaim them as incompetent judges, not to be trusted in a business of such main concernment as the determination of the controversies in the Church of CHRIST; out of an high conceit of their own great worth, which is not willing to acknowledge

a superior eminence. And I know well that many, if not most of our innovators, whether it be in point of discipline or doctrine, decline all trial by the Fathers, Councils, and other the records and monuments of the Catholic Church; because directly contrary to their new devices. But all this moves not me a jot, nor makes me yield the less authority to their words and writings. The Church of England waives not their authority, though some of her conceited children, and others of her factious ones have been pleased to do it. Witness that famous challenge made by Bishop Jewel, by which the several points in issue between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, were generally referred to the decision of the ancient Fathers; with great both honour and success.¹ Witness these words of Peter Martyr, a man of great employment in the Reformation of the Church, and sent for hither by Archbishop Cranmer to mote it here. “In judging things obscure (saith he) there are two ways or means for our direction; whereof the one is *inward*, which is *the SPIRIT*, the other *outward* or external, *the word of GOD*: to which (saith he) Si Patrum etiam autoritas accesserit, valebit plurimum, *If the authority of the Fathers do come in for seconds, it will exceedingly avail.*” And unto this agrees Chemnitius also, though of a different judgment from him in some points of doctrine, who having told us of the Fathers, that we may best learn from their own words and sayings, what we may warrantably conceive of their authority; gives in the close thereof this note, and a sound one it is, “Nullum dogma in Ecclesia novum, et cum tota antiquitate pugnans, recipiendum,” (Chemnit. Examen. de Tradition. c. vi.) That is to say, that no opinion which seems new, and is repugnant to the *general current of antiquity*, is to be entertained in the Church of God. What is decreed herein by the Church of England, assembled representatively in her convocations; what by the king and three estates convened in Parliament; we shall see anon. In the mean time take here the judgment of the *ancients* in this very case. 'Tis true indeed the Fathers

Two ways
of judging
things
obscure,
according to
Peter
Martyr.

¹ See ante, p. 26.

many times and in sundry places humbly and piously have confessed the eminency of *Canonical* Scriptures above all the writings of men whatsoever they be; desiring liberty of dissent from one another when they saw occasion, and binding no man to adhere unto their opinions, further than they agreed with the word of God delivered by the holy Prophets and Apostles, which have been since the world began, “De quorum Scriptis, quod omni errore careant dubitare nefarium est,” (August. Epist. xix.) and of whose writings to make question whether or not they were free from error, were a great impiety. And this is that whereof St. Jerom speaks in an epistle to Pope Damasus, “Ut mihi Epistolis tuis sive tacendarum sive dicendarum *Hypostaseon* detur autoritas,” (Hieronym ad Damas. Epist. lvii.) that he might be left to his own liberty either in using or refusing the word *Hypostasis*. But then it is as true withal, that Vincentius gave it for a rule, “Multorum et magnorum consentientes sibi sententias Magistrorum sequendas esse,” that the ancient consent of godly Fathers is with great care to be searched into and followed in the *rule of faith*. And 'tis as true, that having moved this question in another place, that if the Canon of the Scripture be so full and perfect, and so abundantly *sufficient* in itself for all things, “Quod opus est ut ei Ecclesiasticæ intelligentiæ jungatur autoritas?” What need is there that the authority of *ecclesiastical interpretations* should be joined with it? returns this answer in effect, Lest every man should wrest the Scriptures to his own private fancy, and rather draw some things from thence to maintain his errors, than for the advancement of the truth. Of the same resolution and opinion was St. Augustine also, who though he were exceeding careful upon all occasions to yield to the Scriptures all due reverence: yet he was willing therewithal to allow that honour which was meet, both to the writings of the Fathers which lived before him, and to the Canons and Decrees of preceding Councils, and to submit himself unto their authorities. For, speaking of General Councils, he subjoins this note, “Quorum est in Ecclesia saluberrima autoritas,” (Augustin in Epist. cxviii.) that their

authority in the Church was of excellent use. And in another place alleging the testimonies of Irenæus, Cyprian, Hilary, Ambrose, and some other Fathers, he concludeth thus: "Hoc probavimus autoritate *Catholicorum* sanctorum," &c. (Id. contr. Julian. Pelagi, lib. 2. c. ix.) This we have proved by the authority of *Catholic* and godly men, to the end that your weak and silly novelties might be overwhelmed with their only authority; with which your contumacy is to be repressed. (He speaks this unto Julian a Pelagian heretic.) And with these testimonies and authorities of such holy men, thou must either by God's mercy be healed, (*i. e.* recovered from his error) or else accuse the famous and right holy Doctors of the Catholic Church; against which miserable madness I must so reply, that their faith may be defended against thee, even as *the Gospel itself* is defended against the wicked and professed enemies of CHRIST." (Id. ibid. c. x.) More of this kind might be produced from the ancient writers. But what need more be said in so clear a point, especially to us who have the honour to be called the children of the Church of England, who by a Canon of the year 1572 doth bind all men in Holy Orders, not to preach any thing in their congregations, to be believed and holden of the people of God, but what is consonant to the doctrine of the Old and New Testaments, "Quodque ex illa ipsa doctrina Catholici Patres et Veteres Episcopi collegerint," and had been thence concluded or collected (take which word you will) by the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops of the Church. The like authority and respect is given to the *first four General Councils* by the unanimous vote and suffrage of the Prince and three estates convened in Parliament, in the first year of Queen Elizabeth of famous memory, wherein it was ordained or declared rather amongst other things, that "nothing should be deemed or adjudged heresy, in the kingdom of England, but what had been adjudged so formerly in any other of the said four General Councils, or any other General Council, determining the same according to the word of God," &c. Where we may see that the Estates in Parliament did ascribe so much to the authority of those four Councils, and

the judgment of the Fathers which were there assembled ; as not to question any thing which they had determined concerning heresy ; *or to examine whether it agreed with God's word or not* : but left the people of this kingdom totally *to repose themselves upon their authority*, and to take that for heresy without more ado, which they judged to be so. And so I close this point with those words of Saravia, a learned man, and one that stood up stoutly in this Church's cause, against the innovating humour which was then predominant, (though not so high as in these times of anarchy) "*Qui omnem Patribus adimit auctoritatem, nullam relinquit sibi*:" (Saravia de divers. ministerii gradibus.) That is to say, He who depriveth the Fathers of their due authority, will only teach posterity to give none to himself.—*On the Apostles' Creed*. Fol. 1654. *Preface*, pp. 21—23.

What traditions are received by the Anglican Church.

There are many kinds of traditions allowed of and received by the Protestant Doctors, such as have laboured learnedly for the beating down of Popery and all popish superstitions of what kind soever. Chemnitius, that learned and laborious canvasser of the Council of Trent, (*Examen. Concil. Trident. sess. 4.*) alloweth of six kinds of tradition to be held in the Church : with whom agreeth our learned Field in his fourth book *of the Church* and twentieth chapter.¹ Of these he maketh the first kind to be the gospel itself, delivered first by the Apostles *viva voce*, by preaching, conference, and such ways of lively expressions, "*et postea literis consignata*," and after committed unto writing, as they saw occasion. The second is of such things as at first depend on the authority and approbation of the Church, but after win credit of themselves, and yield sufficient satisfaction unto all men of the divine infallible truths contained in them : and of this kind is that tradition which hath transmitted to us from time to time, the names and number of the Books of canonical Scripture. The third is that which Irenæus and Tertullian speak of, and that, saith he, is the transmission of those

¹ See ante, p. 43.

articles of the Christian faith, “quos Symbolum Apostolicorum complectitur,” which are contained in the Apostles’ Creed or Symbol. The fourth touching the Catholic sense and interpretation of the word of God, derived to us by the works and studies of the Fathers, by them received from the Apostles, and recommended to posterity. The fifth kind is of such things as have been in continual practice, whereof there is neither precept nor example in the holy Scripture, *though the grounds, reasons and causes of such practice be therein contained*; of which sort is the baptism of infants, and the keeping of the LORD’S-day, or first day of the week, for which there is no manifest command in the Book of God; but by way of probable deduction only. The sixth and last sort is “de quibusdam vetustis ritibus,” of many ancient rites and customs, which in regard of their *antiquity* are usually referred unto the Apostles: of which kind there were many in the primitive times, but alterable and dispensable, according to the circumstances of times and persons. And of this kind are those traditions spoken of in our book of Articles, where it is said, that “it is not necessary that *traditions* and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like, in that at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men’s manners, so that nothing be ordained against God’s Word.” So that the question between us and the Church of Rome, is not in this, as many ignorant men are made believe, whether there be or not any such traditions as justly can derive themselves from the Apostles, or whether such traditions be to be admitted in a Church well constituted. I know no moderate understanding Protestant, who makes doubt of either. The question briefly stated is no more than this, that is to say, whether the traditions which the Church of Rome doth pretend unto, be Apostolical or not. Now for the finding out of such traditions as are truly and undoubtedly Apostolical, there are but these two rules to be considered: the first, St. Austin’s, and is this, “Quod universa tenet ecclesia” (Contra Donat. lib. iv. c. 23), that whatsoever the Church holdeth, and hath always held from time to time, *not being*

decreed in any Council, may justly be believed to proceed from no other ground than Apostolical authority. The second rule is this, and that's a late learned Protestant's, that "whatsoever all, or the most famous and renowned in all ages, or at the least in divers ages, have constantly delivered, as from them that went before them, no man gain-saying or doubting of it without check or censure, that also is believed to be an Apostolical tradition"¹ (Field, l. iv. c. 21). By which two rules if we do measure the traditions of the Church of Rome, such as they did ordain in the Council of Trent to be embraced and entertained, "*pari pietatis affectu*," with the like ardour of affection as the written word; what will become of prayer for the dead and purgatory, the invocation of the saints departed, the worshipping of images, adoration of reliques, single life of priests, and the like to these? Assuredly they are all so far from having the general consent of all times, that generally they have had the consent of none; no, not so much as the Church of Rome itself, till the candle of all good literature was put out by the night of ignorance.—*On the Apostles' Creed. Preface*, pp. 12, 13.

Of the Holy
Catholic
Church.

When we say that *we believe the Holy Catholic Church*, we do not mean that we do only believe that there is a Church upon the earth which for the latitude thereof may be called *Catholic*, and for the piety of the professors may be counted *holy*; but also that we do believe that the Church is led by the SPIRIT of GOD into all necessary truths; and being so taught, becomes our *schoolmistress* unto CHRIST, by making us acquainted with His will and pleasure; and therefore that we are to yield obedience unto her decisions, determining according to the Word of GOD. . . . The Church commends the Scripture to us as the Word of GOD, which she hath carefully preserved from the time of Moses to this day; and so far we are willing to give credence to her, as to believe that therein she hath done the duty of a faithful *witness*, not giving testimony to any supposititious or corrupted text, but to that only which doth

¹ See ante, p. 44.

carry the impressions in it of the image and divine character of the SPIRIT of GOD. But if a difference do arise about the sense and meaning of this very Scripture, or any controversy do break forth on the misunderstanding of it, or the applying and perverting it to men's private purposes (which is the great source and fountain of all sects and heresies), we will not therein hearken to the voice of the Church, but every man will be a Church to himself, and follow the *dictamen* (or the *illumination*, as they please to call it) of their *private spirit*. It therefore was good counsel of a learned man of our own, "not to indulge too much to our own affections, or trust too much unto the strength of a single judgment in the controverted points of faith; *but rather to rely on the authority and judgment of the Church* therein. For seeing (saith he) that the controversies of religion in our time are grown in number so many, and in nature so intricate, that few have time and leisure, and fewer strength of understanding to examine them; what remaineth for men desirous of satisfaction in things of such consequence, but diligently to search out which of all the societies of men in the world, is that blessed company of holy ones, that household of faith, that Spouse of CHRIST, and Church of the living GOD, which is the PILLAR AND GROUND OF TRUTH; that so we may embrace her communion, *follow her directions, and rest in her judgment?*" (Field, *of the Church*, in Epist. Dedic.) Very good counsel, I confess, and such as is to be pursued by all sober Christians.—*Art. IX. c. iii. pp. 390, 391.*

That the universal Church should so fall away as to teach any doctrine contrary to the faith and gospel, is plainly contrary to the promise made by CHRIST our SAVIOUR. It is true, indeed, CHRIST hath not bound himself, nor annexed His SPIRIT so inseparably to a *national* or *provincial* Church, but that it may fall at last into such desperate and dangerous errors, as finally may cut it off as an unsound member from the residue of the body mystical. The candlestick may be removed as well out of any Church as from that of Ephesus (Apoc. ii. 5), if wilfully they put out the

The Catholic
Church in-
defectible.

light which shined amongst them; and so it is determined by the Church of England (Art. XIX.); but so it is not with the *universal*, the body collective of God's people, the Church essential; nor can it be colourably inferred that because many of those who are outwardly called, and some of the elect themselves, many of the flock, and some of the pastors, and that not only in their single and sole capacities, but as convened in Council about sacred matters, have held opinions contrary to the truth of God; that therefore the *whole* Church, or body *collective* and *diffusive* over all the world, shall *universally* agree to betray the truth, or be given over unto error.—*Art. IX. c. iii. p. 395.*

The Catholic
Church the
Interpreter
of Scripture.

The fourth and last office [of the Church] is *Interpretis*, of an interpreter or expounder of the Word of God, which in many places are so hard to be understood, that “ignorant and unstable men” may, and do often, “wrest them to their own destruction” (2 Pet. iii. 16), who, therefore, are to have recourse to the priests of God, “whose lips preserve knowledge,” and from whose mouth the people are to take the explication of the Law of God. But being it happeneth many times that the priests and ministers themselves do not agree upon the sense of holy Scripture, and that no small disturbance hath been raised in the Church of CHRIST, by reason of such different interpretations as are made thereof, every one making it to speak in favour of his own opinion; the body of the Church assembled in her *representatives*, hath the full power of making such interpretation of the places controverted, as may conclude all parties in her exposition; both Protestants and Papists do agree in this, not all, but some of each side, and no mean ones neither. “*Sacræ Scripturæ sensus natus et indubitatus, ab Ecclesia Catholica est petendus*” (Petr. à Soto. Assert. Cath. de Eccle.), so said Petrus à Soto for the Papist. “The proper and undoubted sense of holy Scripture is to be sought (saith he) from the Catholic Church;” which is indeed the general opinion of the Roman schools. And to the same effect, saith Luther for the Protestant Doctors, “*De nullo privato homine nos certos esse habeant necne*

revelationem Patris, Ecclesiam unam esse de qua non liceat dubitare" (Luth. ap Bellarm. de Verb. Dei, lib. i. 5). "We cannot be assured," said he, "of private persons, whether or not they have a revelation from the Father of truth; it is the Church alone whereof we need make no question." Which words, considering the temper of the man, and how much he ascribed to his own spirit in expounding Scripture, may serve instead of many testimonies from the Protestant writers who look with reverence on him as the first Reformer. This also was the judgment of the ancient Fathers. St. Augustine thus: "We do uphold the truth of Scripture when we do that which the universal Church demandeth, recommended by the authority of holy Scripture; and forasmuch as the Scriptures cannot deceive us, a man that would not willingly err in a point of such obscurity (as that then in question) ought to inquire the Church's judgment" (August. cont. Crescon. lib. i. c. 33). With him agrees St. Ambrose also, who much commends the Emperor Gratian, for referring the interpretation of a doubtful text unto the judgment of his Bishops convened in Council. "Ecce quid statuit Imperator? Noluit injuriam facere sacerdotibus, ipsos interpretes constituit Episcopos;" "Behold," saith he, "what the good Christian Emperor did ordain therein? Because he would not derogate from the power of the Bishops, he made them the interpreters." Thus Innocent, one of the popes, doth affirm in Gratian, "Facilius invenire quod à pluribus senioribus quæritur" (Distinct. quinta cap. de quibus), *i. e.* the meaning of the Scripture is soonest found when it is sought of many Presbyters or Elders convened together. And reason good. For seeing "that no prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation," because it came originally from such holy men, "who spake as they were moved by the HOLY GHOST" (2Pet. i. 20, 21); it is not subject to the humour of a *private spirit*, but to be weighed and pondered by that *public spirit* which God hath given unto His Church, which He hath promised to conduct in the *ways of truth*, and to be with her *always to the end of the world*. Not that we do exclude any private man from handling of the holy Scripture, if he come

sanctified and prepared for so great a work, if he be *lawfully ordained* or called unto it, and *use such helps as are expedient and necessary to inform his judgment*; nor that we give the Church such a supreme power, as to *change* the sense and meaning of the holy Scriptures, according as herself may vary from one opinion to the other in the course of times.

This is indeed the monstrous paradox of Cusanus, who telleth us, "That the Scripture is fitted to the time, and variously to be understood, so that at one time it is expounded according to the present fancy of the Church, and when that fancy is changed, that then the sense of Scripture may be also changed; and that when the Church doth change her judgment, God doth change His also." (Card. Cusan. Ep. 2 and 7.) And this I call a monstrous paradox, as indeed it is; in that it doth not only assubject the truth of Scripture, but even the God of truth Himself, to the Church's pleasure.

How much more piously hath the Church of England determined in it; who though it do assert its own power in expounding Scripture, yet doth it with this wise and religious caution, "that the Church may not so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another," (Art. XX.) within which bounds, if she contain herself, and restrain her power, no doubt but she may use it to the honour of God, the settling of a public peace in all matters controverted, and the content and satisfaction of all sober Christians.—*Art. IX. c. iii. p. 402, 403.*

SANDERSON, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.

B. 1587. D. 1662.

Tradition.

The orthodox Bishops and Doctors in the ancient Church, being to maintain the Trinity of persons in the Godhead, the Consubstantiality of the SON with the FATHER, the Hypostatical union of the two natures in the Person of CHRIST, the Divinity of the HOLY GHOST, and other like articles of the Catholic religion against the Arians, Eunomians, Macedonians, and other heretics; for that the words

Trinity, Homoüision, Hypostasis, Procession, &c. (which for the better expressing of the Catholic sense they were forced to use) were not *expressly* to be found in the holy Scriptures; had recourse, therefore, very often in their writings against the heretics of their times, to the TRADITION OF THE CHURCH. Whereby they meant *not* (as the Papists would now wrest their words) any *unwritten doctrine not contained in the Scriptures*, but *the very doctrine of the Scriptures* themselves, as they had been constantly understood and believed by all faithful Christians in the Catholic Church, down from the Apostles' times till the several present ages in which they lived.—*Serm. on St. Matt. xv. 9. Sermons, Fol. 1689.*

After observing that “holy Scripture is certainly that *Lapis Lydius*, that test” whereby the trial of any doctrine is to be made, the Bishop proceeds thus :

But sith all sectaries pretend to Scripture; Papists, Anabaptists, Disciplinarians, all; yea, the Devil himself can vouch texts to drive on a temptation; it were good therefore we know how far to make right applications of Scripture, for the trial of doctrines, that we do not mistake a false one for a true one. Many profitable rules our Apostle affordeth us in sundry places. One very good one we may gather from the words immediately before the text, wherein *the Church of God* is said to be the *pillar and ground of truth*. The collection thence is obvious, that it would very much conduce to the guiding of our judgments aright in the examining of men's doctrines concerning either faith or manners, wherein the *letter* of Scripture is *obscure*, or the *meaning doubtful*, to inform ourselves as well as we can, *in credendis*, what the received sense, and *in agendis*, what the constant usage and practice of the Church (especially in the ancient times) hath been concerning those matters: and that to consider what conformity the doctrines under trial hold with the principles upon which that their sense or practice in the premises was grounded. *The judgment and practice of the Church ought to sway very much with every sober and wise man: either*

The Catholic Church a guide to the right understanding of Scripture.

of which, whosoever neglecteth, or but *slighteth* (as too many do, upon a very poor pretence that “the mystery of iniquity” began to work betimes) *runneth into a great hazard of falling into many errors and absurdities*. If he do *not*, he may thank his good fortune more than his forecast: and if he *do*, he may thank none but himself for neglecting so good a guide.—*Sermon on 1 Tim. iii. 16. Sermons.*

BRAMHALL, ARCHBISHOP AND CONFESSOR.

B. 1597. D. 1663.

The rule of
Faith.

We have a certain rule of faith, the Apostles' Creed dilated in the Scriptures, or the Scriptures contracted into the Apostles' Creed. . . . as it is explained in the four first general Councils.—*Schism Guarded*. Disc. IV. p. 417. *Works. Dublin, Fol. 1676.*

Ibid.

He [Mr. Sergeant,] argueth, “all those heretics [the Jacobites, Nestorians, &c.] had the same grounds of faith as Protestants have, namely, the holy Scripture, therefore they are all of the Protestant communion.” In good time. All those heretics had the same rule or grounds of the faith that Roman Catholics have, namely, the holy Scriptures, therefore they are of the Roman Catholic communion. If he except that the *bare letter* of Scripture is not the ground or rule of faith to Roman Catholics, but the Scripture interpreted according to the analogy of faith and Tradition of the Church, the Church of England saith the very same for itself. So if this be the source of all error, to abandon the Tradition of the Church, *we* are far enough from the source of all error. This is the only difference, in this particular, between me and Mr. Sergeant: what he attributes to the tradition of *immediate forefathers*, I ascribe to the *perpetual and universal Tradition of the Catholic Church*.—*Schism Guarded*, Disc. IV. *Works*, p. 417.

Ibid.

His [Baxter's] fifth note of Grotians, to deny the suffi-

ciency of Scripture in all things necessary to salvation might well have been spared, for we all maintain it as well as he, but he shuffles into the question such impertinent and confused generalities about the peace of the Church and traditions, as deserve no answer. The sufficiency of Scripture is not inconsistent either with prudential government, or the *necessary* means of finding out the true sense of Scripture. — *Vindication of Grotius*, Tom. II. Disc. iii. *Works*, p. 615.

Thou art for Tradition, so am I. But my Tradition is Tradition. not the tradition of one particular Church contradicted by the tradition of another Church, but the universal and perpetual Tradition of the Christian world united. Such a tradition is a full proof, which is received *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*; always, everywhere, and by all Christians. Neither do I look upon the opposition of a handful of heretics, (they are no more being compared to the innumerable multitudes of Christians,) in one or two ages, as inconsistent with universality, any more than the highest mountains are inconsistent with the roundness of the earth. — *Address to Roman Catholics. Schism Guarded. Works*, p. 290.

Three things offer themselves to be considered:—first, concerning the rule of Scripture; secondly, the proper expounding thereof; and thirdly, the manner of exposition.

Concerning Scripture we believe, that it was impossible for human reason, without the help of divine revelation, to find out these supernatural truths which are necessary to salvation. Secondly, that to supply this defect of natural reason, GOD out of His abundant goodness hath given us the holy Scriptures, which have not their authority from the writing that is human, but from the revelation which is divine, from the HOLY GHOST. Thirdly, that this being the purpose of the HOLY GHOST, it is blasphemy to say He would not, or could not attain unto it; and that therefore the holy Scriptures do comprehend all necessary

The Scripture the rule of Supernatural Truths.

supernatural truths. So much is confessed by Bellarmine, that "all things which are necessary to be believed, and to be done by all Christians, were preached by all the Apostles, and were all written." (Lib. IV. de Verbo Dei, cap. ii.) Fourthly, that the Scripture is more properly to be called a rule of supernatural truths than a judge; or if it be sometimes called a judge, it is no otherwise than the Law is called a judge of civil controversies between man and man, that is, the rule of judging what is right and what is wrong. That which showeth what is straight, showeth likewise what is crooked.

Who are
the proper
expounders
of Scripture,
and how far.

Secondly, concerning the proper expounders of Scripture, we do believe that the Gospel doth not consist in the words, but in the sense; "non in superficie, sed in medullâ;" and therefore that, though this infallible rule be given for the common benefit of all, yet, every one is not an able or fit artist to make application of this rule, in all particular cases. To preserve the common right, and yet prevent particular abuses, we distinguish judgment into three kinds:—

Judgment of discretion; judgment of direction; and judgment of jurisdiction.

As in the former instance of the Law (the ignorance whereof excuseth no man), every subject hath judgment of discretion, to apply it particularly to the preservation of himself, his estate and interest; the advocates, and those who are skilful in the Law, have moreover a judgment of direction, to advise others of less knowledge and experience; but those who are constituted, by the sovereign power, to determine emergent difficulties, and differences, and to distribute and administer justice to the whole body of a province or kingdom, have moreover a judgment of jurisdiction, which is not only discretionary, or directive, but authoritative, to impose an obligation of obedience unto those who are under their charge. If these last shall transgress the rule of the Law, they are not accountable to their inferiors, but to him or them that have the sovereign power of legislative judicature; "Ejus est Legem interpretari, cujus est condere."

To apply this to the case in question concerning the exposition of the holy Scripture. Every Christian keeping himself within the bounds of due obedience and submission to his lawful superiors, hath a judgment of *discretion*; “prove all things, hold fast that which is good.” 1 Thess. v. 21. He may apply the rule of holy Scripture for his own private instruction, comfort, edification, and direction, and for the framing of his life and belief accordingly. The pastors of the Church (who are placed over God’s people as watchmen and guides) have more than this, a judgment of *direction* to expound and interpret the holy Scriptures to others, and out of them to instruct the ignorant, to reduce them who wander out of the right way, to confute errors, to foretell dangers, and to draw sinners to repentance. The chief pastors, to whose care the regiment of the Church is committed in a more special manner, have yet an higher degree of judgment, a judgment of *jurisdiction*, to prescribe, to enjoin, to constitute, to reform, to censure, to condemn, to bind, to loose, judicially, authoritatively, in their respective charges. If their key shall err, either their key of knowledge or their key of jurisdiction, they are accountable to their respective superiors, and in the last place to a General Council, which under CHRIST, upon earth, is the highest judge of controversies. Thus we have seen what is the rule of faith, and by whom, and how far respectively, this rule is to be applied.

Thirdly, for the manner of expounding holy Scriptures, (for there may be a privacy in this also, and more dangerous than the privacy of the person) many things are necessary to the right interpretation of the Law, to understand the reason of it, the precedents, the terms, the forms, the reports, and ability to compare law with law. He that wants but some of them, or wants the perfection of them, by how much the greater is his defect, by so much the less valuable is his exposition; and if he shall, out of private fancy or blind presumption, arrogate to himself, without these requisite means, or above his capacity and proportion of knowledge, a power of expounding of knowledge, a power of expounding Law, he is a madman. So many things are

The manner
of expound-
ing holy
Scriptures.

required to render a man capable to expound the holy Scriptures, some more necessarily, some less, some absolutely, some respectively. As first, to know the right analogy of faith, to which all interpretations of Scripture must be necessarily conformed. Secondly, to know the practice and Tradition of the Church, and the received expositions of former interpreters in the successive ages, which gives a great light to the finding out of the right sense. Thirdly, to be able to compare texts with texts, antecedents and consequents, without which one can hardly attain to the drift and scope of the HOLY GHOST in the obscurer passages. And lastly, it is something to know the idiotisms of that language wherein the Scriptures were written. He that wants all these requisites, and yet takes upon him, out of a fanatic presumption of private illumination, to interpret Scripture, is a doting enthusiast, fitter to be refuted with scorn than with arguments. He that presumes above that degree and proportion which he hath in these means, and above the talent which GOD hath given him (as he that hath a little language, yet wants logic, or having both language and logic, knows not, or regards not, either the judgment of former expositors, or the practice and Tradition of the purest primitive ages, or the symbolical faith of the Catholic Church), *is not a likely workman to build a temple to the LORD, but ruin and destruction to himself and his seduced followers.* A new physician (we say) requires a new churchyard; but such bold, ignorant empirics in theology, are ten times more dangerous to the soul than an ungrounded, unexperienced, quacksalver to the body.

This is conformable to the doctrine and practice of our Church.

This hath always been the doctrine and the practice of our English Church: first, it is so far from admitting laymen to be directive interpreters of holy Scripture, that it allows not this liberty to clergymen so much as *to gloss upon the text* until they be licensed to become preachers. Secondly, for judgment of discretion only, it gives it not to private persons above their talent, or *beyond their last*. It disallows all fantastical and enthusiastical presumption of incompetent and unqualified expositors. It admits no man into holy orders, that is, to be capable of being made a

directive interpreter of Scripture, howsoever otherwise qualified, unless he be able to give a good account of his faith in the Latin tongue, so as to be able to frame all his expositions according to the analogy thereof. It forbids the licensed preachers to teach the people any doctrine as necessary to be religiously held and believed, which the Catholic Fathers, and old Bishops of the primitive Church have not collected out of the Scriptures. It ascribes a judgment of jurisdiction over preachers to Bishops, in all manner of ecclesiastical duties, as appears by the whole body of our canons. And especially where any difference or public opposition hath been between preachers about any point or doctrine deduced out of Scripture. It gives a power of determining all emergent controversies of faith above Bishops to the Church, as to the witness and keeper of the sacred oracles; and to a lawful synod, as the representative Church.

We receive not your upstart supposititious traditions, nor unwritten fundamentals; but we admit genuine, universal, apostolical traditions: as the Apostles' Creed, the Perpetual Virginity of the Mother of God, the Anniversary Festivals of the Church, the Lenten Fast. Yet we know that both the duration of it, and the manner of observing it, was very different in the primitive times. We believe episcopacy to an ingenuous person may be proved out of Scripture without the help of Tradition; but to such as are froward, the perpetual practice and Tradition of the Church, renders the interpretation of the text more authentic, and the proof more convincing. What is this to us who admit the practice and Tradition of the Church as an excellent help of exposition? Use is the best interpreter of laws, and we are so far from believing, that we cannot admit Tradition without allowing the Papacy, that one of the principal motives why we rejected the Papacy, as it is now established with universality of jurisdiction, by the institution of CHRIST, and superiority above Œcumenical Councils, and infallibility of judgment, was the constant Tradition of the primitive Church.—*Epistle to M. de la Militiere*, Tom. I. Dis. i. *Works*, pp. 33—35.

The Angli-
can Church,
primitive in
Doctrine.

We keep ourselves to the old faith of the whole Christian world, that is, the Creed of the Apostles explicated by the Nicene, Constantinopolitan, Ephesine, and Chalcedonian Fathers; the same which was professed by them of old at their baptism, and is still professed by us at our baptism; the same wherein all the Christian world, and themselves among the rest, were baptized. None of us all ever made any profession at our baptisms of the universality of the Roman Church, or of the sovereign monarchical power of the Roman bishop by divine right, or of the doctrine of transubstantiation, indulgences, image worship, or the like. Wherefore we resolved to adhere to that faith which hath been professed *always, everywhere, and by all persons*, and particularly, both by them and us at our baptisms, in which faith, and which alone, we were made Christians, without any diminution or addition of new essentials.—*Schism guarded*, Tom. I. Dis. iv. *Works*, pp. 349, 350.

Who are
Catholics.

Whosoever doth preserve his obedience entire to the universal Church, and its representative, a General Council, and to all his superiors in their due order, so far as by law he is obliged; who holds an internal communion with all Christians, and an external communion, so far as he can, with a good conscience; who approves no reformation but that which is made by lawful authority, upon sufficient grounds, with due moderation; who derives his Christianity by the uninterrupted line of apostolical succession; who contents himself with his proper place in the ecclesiastical body; who disbelieves nothing contained in holy Scripture, and if he holds any errors unwittingly and unwillingly, doth implicitly renounce them by his fuller adherence to that infallible rule; who believeth and practiseth all those *credenda* and *agenda*, which the universal Church, spread over the face of the earth, doth unanimously believe and practise as necessary to salvation, without condemning or censuring others of different judgment from himself in inferior questions, without obtruding his own opinions upon others as articles of faith; who is implicitly prepared to believe and do all other speculative and practical truths

when they shall be revealed to him; and in sum, “*qui sententiam diversæ opinionis vinculo non præponit unitatis*” (Aug. lib. ii. cont. Cresc.), that prefers not a subtlety or imaginary truth before the bond of peace. He may securely say, my name is Christian, my surname is Catholic.—*Just Vindication of the Church of England*, Tom. I. Dis. ii. *Works*, p. 61.

USHER, ARCHBISHOP.

B. 1580. D. 1666.

We willingly acknowledge that the Word of GOD, which Tradition. by some of the Apostles was set down in writing, was both by themselves and others of their fellow-labourers delivered by word of mouth; and that the Church in succeeding ages was bound not only to preserve those sacred writings committed to her trust, but also to deliver unto her children, *vivâ voce*, the form of wholesome words contained therein. Traditions, therefore, of this nature, come not within the compass of our controversy, the question being betwixt us, *de ipsâ doctrinâ aditâ*, not *de tradendi modo*; touching the *substance of the doctrine delivered*, not of *the manner of delivering it*. Again, it must be remembered, that here we speak of the doctrine delivered as *the Word of GOD*, that is, of points of religion revealed unto the Prophets and Apostles for the perpetual information of GOD's people; not of rites and ceremonies, and other ordinances, which are left to the disposition of the Church, and consequently be not of divine, but of positive and human right. Traditions, therefore, of this kind likewise are not properly brought within the circuit of this question.—*Answer to a Jesuit*. Edit. 1631, p. 35.

In all places of the world where the ancient foundations were retained, and these common principles of faith, upon the profession whereof men have ever been wont to be admitted by baptism into the Church of CHRIST, there we doubt not but our LORD had His subjects, and we our fellow-servants, for we bring in no new faith, nor no new Church. . . . That which in the time of the ancient Fathers

The Catholic Church defectible in matters of faith.

was accounted to be “truly and properly Catholic,” namely, “that which was believed *everywhere, always, and by all*,” that in *the succeeding ages hath evermore been preserved*, and is at this day entirely professed in our Church. And it is well observed by a learned man (Serranus, Appar. ad Fid. Cath.), who hath written a full discourse of this argument, that “whatsoever the father of lies hath attempted, or shall attempt, yet neither hath he hitherto effected, nor shall ever bring it to pass hereafter, that this Catholic doctrine, ratified by the common consent of Christians always and everywhere, should be abolished, but that in the thickest mist rather of the most perplexed troubles, it still obtained victory, both in the minds and in the open confessions of all Christians, no way overturned in the foundation thereof; and that in this verity, that one Church of CHRIST was preserved in the midst of the tempests of the most cruel winter, or in the thickest darkness of her wanings.” Thus, if at this day, we should take a survey of the several professions of Christianity that have any large spread in any part of the world, as of the religion of the Roman and the Reformed Churches in our quarters, of the Egyptians and Ethiopians in the south, of the Grecians and other Christians in the eastern parts, and should put by the points wherein they did differ one from another, and gather into one body the rest of the articles wherein they all did generally agree, we should find, that *in those propositions which without all controversy are universally received in the whole Christian world, so much truth is contained*, as, being joined with holy obedience, may be *sufficient to bring a man unto everlasting salvation*. Neither have we cause to doubt, but that “as many as do walk according to this rule” (neither overthrowing that which they have builded, by superinducing any “damnable heresies” thereupon, nor otherwise vitiating their “holy faith” with a lewd and wicked conversation), “peace shall be upon them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God.” Now these common principles of the Christian faith, which we call *κοινόπιστα*, or things “generally believed” of all, as they have *universality*, and *antiquity*, and *consent* concurring with them, which, by

Vincentius's rule, are the special character of that which is truly and properly Catholic, so for their duration we are sure *that they have still held out*, and been kept as the *seminary* of the Catholic Church in the darkest and difficultest times that ever have been.—*Sermon on Eph. iv. 13.*¹

TAYLOR, DOCTOR, BISHOP, AND CONFESSOR.

B. 1613. D. 1667.

Because the Books of Scripture were not all written at Tradition. once, nor at once communicated, nor at once received, therefore the Churches of God at first were forced to trust their memories, and to try the doctrines by appealing to the memories of others, that is, to the consenting report and faith delivered and preached to other Churches, especially the the chiefest, where the memory of Apostles was recent and permanent. The mysteriousness of CHRIST's priesthood, the perfection of His sacrifice and the unity of it, CHRIST's advocacy and intercession for us in heaven, might well be accounted traditions before St. Paul's epistle to the Hebrews was admitted for canonical, but now they are written truths; and if they had not been written, it is likely we should have lost them. But this way could not long be necessary, and could not long be safe. *Not necessary*, because it was supplied by a better; and to be tied to what was only necessary in the first state of things, is just as if a man should always be tied to suck milk, because at first, in his infancy, it was fit he should. *Not safe*, because it grew worse and worse every day. And therefore in a little while, even the traditions themselves were so far from being the touchstone of true doctrine, that themselves were brought to the stone of trial, and the tradition would not be admitted, unless it were in Scripture.² By which it appears that Tradition could not be a part of the rule of faith, distinct from the Scripture, *but itself was a part of it*, that is, whatsoever was delivered and preached was recorded; which they so firmly believed, that they rejected the tradition unless it

¹ See *British Critic*. No. XL., pp. 381, 382.

² See Keble's *Visitation Sermon*, 1st. edit., p. 28.

were so recorded; and, 2. It hence also follows, that Tradition was, and was esteemed, the worst way of conveying propositions and stories; because the Church required that the tradition should be proved by Scriptures, that is, the less certain by the more; that this was so, St. Cyprian is a sufficient witness; for when Pope Stephen had said, "let nothing be changed, only that which is delivered," meaning the old tradition "that was to be kept;" St. Cyprian inquires from whence that tradition comes?—"Does it come from the gospels, or the epistles, or the Acts of the Apostles?" So that after the writing and reception of Scriptures, *Tradition meant the same thing which was in Scripture*; or if it did not, the Fathers would not admit it.—*Dissuasive from Popery*, Part II. sect. 3, p. 423. Fol. 1673.

Tradition.

When the Fathers appeal to Tradition, and with much earnestness and some clamour they call upon heretics to conform to, or to be tried by Tradition, it is such a tradition as delivers the fundamental points of Christianity, *which were also recorded in Scripture*. But because the Canon was not yet perfectly consigned, they called to that testimony they had, which was the testimony of the Churches apostolical, whose "Bishops and priests, being the *Antistites religionis*,"¹ did believe and preach Christian religion, and conserve all its great mysteries according as they have been taught. Irenæus calls this a tradition apostolical, "CHRISTUM accipisse calicem, et dixisse sanguinem suum esse, et docuisse novam oblationem novi Testamenti, quam Ecclesia per Apostolos accipiens offert per totum mundum."² And the Fathers in these ages confute heretics by ecclesiastical Tradition; that is, they confront against their impious and blasphemous doctrines, that religion which the Apostles having taught to the Churches where they did preside, their successors did still preach; and for a long while together suffered not the

¹ Chief authorities in religion.

² "That CHRIST took the cup, and said it was His own blood, and taught the new oblations of the New Testament, which the Church receiving from the Apostles, offers throughout the whole world."

enemy to sow tares amongst their wheat. And yet these doctrines, which they called traditions, were nothing but such fundamental truths which were in Scripture πάντα σύμφωνα ταῖς γραφαῖς, as Irenæus in Eusebius (Lib. V. c. xx.) observes, in the instance of Polycarpus; and it is manifest, by considering what heresies they fought against, the heresies of Ebion, Cerinthus, Nicolaitans, Valentianus, Carpocratians, (*Vide* Irenæ. Lib. III. & IV. cont. Hæres.) persons that denied the SON of GOD, the unity of the Godhead, that preached impurity, that practised sorcery and witchcraft. And now, that they did rather urge Tradition against them than Scripture, was because the public doctrine of all the Apostolical Churches was at first more known and famous than many parts of the Scripture; and because some heretics denied St. Luke's Gospel, some received none but St. Matthew's, some rejected all St. Paul's Epistles; and it was a long time before the whole Canon was consigned by universal testimony; some Churches having one part, some another: Rome herself had not all; so that, in this case, the argument from Tradition was the most famous, the most certain, and the most prudent. And now, according to this rule, they had more traditions than we have; and traditions did by degrees lessen as they came to be written, and their necessity was less as the knowledge of them was ascertained to us by a better keeper of divine truth. All that great mysteriousness of CHRIST's priesthood, the unity of His sacrifice, CHRIST's advocacy and intercession for us in heaven, and many other excellent doctrines, might very well be accounted traditions, before St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews was published to all the world, but now they are written truths; and if they had not, possibly we might either have lost them quite, or doubted of them, as we do of many other traditions, by reason of the insufficiency of the propounder. And therefore it was that St. Peter (2 Pet. i. 13) took order that the Gospel should be *writ*; for he had promised that he would do something which, after his decease, should have these things in remembrance. He knew it was not safe trusting the report of men, where the fountain might

quickly run dry, or be corrupted so insensibly, that no cure could be found for it, nor any just notice taken of it till it were incurable. And indeed, there is scarce any thing but what is written in Scripture, that can, with any confidence of argument, pretend to derive from the Apostles, except rituals and manners of ministration; but no doctrine or speculative mysteries are so transmitted to us, by so clear a current, that we may see a visible channel, and trace it to the primitive fountains. — *Of the Liberty of Propheying*, Lect. V. p. 979, 980.

Of the
tradition of
Scripture.

It is said that the Scripture itself is wholly derived to us by Tradition, and therefore, besides Scripture, Tradition is necessary to the Church. And, indeed, no man who understands this question, denies it. This tradition, that these books were written by the Apostles, and were delivered by the Apostles to the Churches as the Word of God, relies principally upon Tradition universal, that is, it was witnessed to be true by all the Christian world at their first being so consigned. Now then *this is no part of the Word of God*, but the notification or manner of conveying the Word of God—the *instrument of its delivery*. So that the tradition concerning the Scriptures being extrinsical to Scripture, is also extrinsical to the question. This tradition cannot be an objection against the sufficiency of Scripture to salvation, but must go before the question. For no man inquires “whether the Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation?” unless he believe that there are Scriptures; that *these* are they, and that they are the word of God. All this comes to us by Tradition, that is, by universal, undeniable testimony. After the Scriptures are thus received, there has risen another question, viz. whether or no these Scriptures so delivered to us, do contain *all* the Word of God?” or, whether or no besides the tradition which goes before Scripture, (which is an instrumental tradition only of Scripture,) there be not also *something else* that is necessary to salvation *consigned by Tradition as well as the Scripture*; and of things as necessary or useful as what is contained in Scripture, and that is equally the Word of

GOD, as Scripture is? The *tradition of Scripture* we receive, but of *nothing else but what is in Scripture*. And if it be asked, why we receive one, and not the rest? we answer, because we have but one tradition of things *necessary*; that is, *there is a universal tradition of Scripture and what concerns it*, but *none* of other things which are not in Scripture. And there is no necessity we should have any, all things necessary and profitable to the salvation of all men being plainly contained in the Scriptures.—*Dissuasive from Popery*, p. 424.

Whatsoever the Apostles did deliver as necessary to Sufficiency of the Scriptures. salvation, all *that* was written in the Scriptures; and to them who believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God, there needs no other magazine of divine truths than the Scripture. . . . And if there be any universal tradition consigned to us by the universal testimony of antiquity, it is this, that *the Scriptures are a perfect repository of all the will of God, and of all the faith of CHRIST*. . . . Upon the supposition of which it follows, that whatever the Church of Rome obtrudes as necessary to salvation as an article of faith, *that is not in Scripture*, is an innovation in matter of faith, and a tyranny over consciences, which, whosoever submits to, prevaricates the rule of the Apostles, commanding us that we stand fast in the liberty with which CHRIST hath set us free.

To the question, whether an ecclesiastical tradition be of equal authority with divine? I answer negatively, and I believe I shall have no adversary in it, except peradventure, some of the jesuited bigots. An ecclesiastical tradition, viz. a positive constitution of the Church delivered from hand to hand, is in the power of the Church to alter; but a divine is not. *Ecclesiastical traditions in matters of faith there are none but what are also divine*; as for rituals ecclesiastical, descending by Tradition, they are confessedly alterable: but till they are altered by abrogation, or desuetude, or contrary custom, or a contrary reason, or the like, they do oblige by virtue of that

authority, whatsoever it is, that hath power over you.—
First Letter to one tempted to the Romish Church, p. 68.

Sufficiency
of the
Scriptures.

It was the challenge of St. Augustine to the Donatists, who (as the Church of Rome does at this day) inclosed the Catholic Church within their own circuits: “Ye say that CHRIST is heir of no lands, but where Donatus is coheir. Read this to us out of the Law and the Prophets, out of the Psalms, out of the Gospel itself, or out of the letters of the Apostles; read it thence, and we will believe it:” (De Unit. Eccl. cap. vi.)—plainly directing us to the fountains of our faith, the Old and New Testament, the words of CHRIST, and the words of the Apostles. *For nothing else can be the foundation of our faith*: whatsoever came in after these “foris est,” it belongs not unto CHRIST.

The value of
primitive
antiquity.

To these we also add, not as authors and finishers, but as helpers of our faith, and heirs of the doctrine apostolical, the sentiments and catholic doctrine of the Church of GOD, in the ages next after the Apostles. Not that we think them or ourselves bound to *every private opinion*, even of a primitive Bishop and Martyr, but that we all acknowledge that the whole Church of GOD kept the faith entire, and transmitted to after ages the whole faith, *τύπον διδακῆς*, “the form of doctrine, and sound words, which was at first delivered to the saints,” and was defective in nothing that belonged unto salvation; and we believe that these ages sent millions of saints to the bosom of CHRIST, and sealed the true faith with their lives and with their deaths, and by both gave testimony unto JESUS, and had from Him the testimony of His SPIRIT We do easily acknowledge, that to dispute these questions from the sayings of the Fathers, is not the readiest way to make an end of them; but, therefore, we do wholly rely upon the Scriptures, as the *foundation* and *final resort* of all our persuasions, and from thence can never be confuted; but we also admit the Fathers as *admirable helps for the understanding of the Scriptures*, and as *good testimony of the doctrine delivered by their forefathers down to*

them, of what the Church esteemed the way of salvation : and therefore if we find any doctrine now taught, which was not placed in their way of salvation, we reject it as being no part of the Christian faith, and which ought not to be imposed upon consciences. They were “wise unto salvation,” and “fully instructed to every good work;” and therefore, the faith, which *they* professed and derived from Scripture, *we* profess also; and in the same faith, we hope to be saved even as they. But for the new Doctors, we understand them not; we know them not; our faith is the same from the beginning, and cannot become new. . . . For the religion of our Church is therefore certainly primitive and apostolic, because it teaches us to believe the whole Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and nothing else as matter of faith; and therefore unless there can be new Scriptures, we can have no new matters of belief, no new articles of faith. Whatsoever we cannot prove from thence, we disclaim it as not deriving from the fountains of our SAVIOUR. We also do believe the Apostles’ Creed, the Nicene with the additions of Constantinople, and that which is commonly called the Symbol of St. Athanasius; and the *four first General Councils* are so entirely admitted by us that they, together with the plain words of Scripture, are made the rule and measure of judging heresies amongst us: and in pursuance of these, it is commanded by our Church that the clergy shall *never teach any thing as matter of faith religiously to be observed, &c.*¹ This was undoubtedly the faith of the primitive Church. They admitted all into their communion that were of this faith. They condemned no man that did not condemn these. They gave letters communicatory by no other cognizance, and all were brethren who spake this voice. . . .

The doctrine of the Anglican Church, primitive and apostolic.

And what faith can be the foundation of a more solid peace; the surer ligaments of Catholic communion; or the firmer basis of a holy life and the hopes of heaven hereafter, than the measures which the Holy Primitive Church did hold, and *we after them*? That which we rely upon is the same which the primitive Church did acknowledge

¹ See ante, p. 5.

to be the adequate foundation of their hopes in the matters of belief. The way which they thought sufficient to go to heaven in, is the way which we walk. What they did not teach, we do not publish and impose. Into this faith entirely, and into no other, as they did theirs, so we baptize our Catechumens. The discriminations of heresy from Catholic doctrine which they used, we use also, and we use no other. And, in short, we believe all that doctrine which the Church of Rome believes, *except those things which they have superinduced upon the old religion*, and in which we shall prove that they have innovated. So that, by their confession, all the doctrine which we teach the people as matter of faith, must be confessed to be ancient, primitive, and apostolic, or else *theirs* is not so. For *ours is the same*, and *we both* have received this faith from the FOUNTAINS OF SCRIPTURE AND UNIVERSAL TRADITION; not *they* from *us*, or *we* from *them*, but *both of us* from CHRIST and His Apostles.—*Dissuasive from Popery*, c. i. sect. i. pp. 286—288.

The Apostles' Creed,
the rule of
faith.

The Apostles, the founders of Christianity, knowing the nature, design, efficacy, and purpose of the Articles of faith, selected such propositions, which in conjunction did integrate our faith, and were therefore necessary to be believed unto salvation; not because these Articles were for themselves commanded to be believed, but because without the belief of them we could not obtain the purposes and designs of faith; that is, we could not be enabled to serve God, to destroy the whole body of sin, to be partakers of the Divine Nature. This Collect or Symbol of propositions is that which is called the *Apostles' Creed*, which I shall endeavour to prove to have been always in the Primitive Church esteemed a full and perfect digest of all the necessary and fundamental articles of Christian Religion; and that beyond this, the Christian faith or the foundation was not to be extended; but this, as it was in the whole complexion necessary, so it was sufficient for all men unto salvation. St. Paul gave us the first formal intimation of this measure, in his advices to St. Timothy: (2 Tim. i. 13.) “Hold fast the form of

sound words which thou hast heard of me in faith and love, which is in CHRIST JESUS. That good thing which was committed unto thee, keep by the HOLY GHOST which dwelleth in us." This was the *Depositum* that St. Paul left with Timothy, the *hypotyposis* or summary of Christian belief, the Christian Creed; which St. Paul (1 Tim. vi. 20.) opposes to the "profane new talkings," and the "disputations" of pretended learning; meaning, that this Symbol of faith is the thing on which all Christians are to rely, and this is the measure of their faith; other things, it is odds, but they are babblings and profane quarrelling, and unedifying argumentations. St. Ignatius recites the substance of this Creed in four of the epistles usually attributed to him; some of which are witnessed by Eusebius and St. Hierom; and adds at the end of it this *epiphonema*: "Hæc qui planè cognôrit et crediderit, beatus est." And St. Irenæus, reciting the same Creed or form of words, differing only in order of placing them, but justly the same articles and foundation of faith, affirms that this is "the faith which the Catholic Church to the very ends of the earth had received from the Apostles and their disciples" (lib. i. c. 2). And this is that Tradition Apostolical of which the Churches of old did so much glory, and to which with so much confidence they appealed, and by which they provoked the heretics to trial. "This preaching and this faith, when the Church scattered over the face of the world had received, she keeps diligently as dwelling in one house; and believes, as having one soul and one heart; and preaches and teaches, and delivers these things, as possessing one mouth. For although there are divers speeches in the world, yet the force of the Tradition is one and the same. Neither do the Churches founded in Germany believe otherwise, *aut aliter tradunt*, or have any other tradition; nor the Iberian Churches, or those among the Celtæ, nor the Churches in the east, in Egypt, or in Lybia, nor those which are in the midst of the world" (cap. iii). But he adds, that this is not only for the ignorant, the idiots, or *catechumeni*; but "neither he who is most eloquent among the Bishops can say any other things than

these; for no man is above his master; neither hath he that is the lowest in speaking lessened the tradition. For the faith is one and the same; he that can speak much, can speak no more; and he that speaks little, says no less." This Creed also he recites again, affirming that even those nations, who had not yet received the books of the Apostles and Evangelists, yet by this confession and this Creed did "please God, and were most wise through faith" (lib. iii. cap. 4); for this is that which he calls the "tradition of the truth," that is, of that truth which the Apostles taught the Church, and by the actual retention of which truth it is that the Church is rightly called "the pillar and ground of truth" by St. Paul; and in relation to this, St. Irenæus reckoned it to be all one, "extra veritatem, id est, extra Ecclesiam" (lib. iv. cap. 62). Upon this Collect of truths the Church was founded, and upon this it was built up; and in this all the Apostolical Churches did hope for life eternal; and by this they opposed all schisms and heresies; as knowing what their and our great Master himself said in His last sermon—"This is life eternal, to know Thee the only true God, and whom Thou hast sent, JESUS CHRIST." (John xvii. 3.) This also is most largely taught by Tertullian, who, when he had recited the Apostolical Creed, in the words and form the Church then used it, calls it the "rule of faith;" he affirms this "rule to have been instituted by CHRIST;" he affirms that it "admits of no questions, and hath none but those which the heresies brought in, and which, indeed, makes heretics." (*Adv. Hæret.* c. xiii. xiv). — *Dissuasive from Popery.* Book I. Part II. pp. 438, 439.

St. Vincent's
rule.

There is nothing simply necessary to salvation now, that was not so always; and this must be confessed by all that admit of the so much commended rule of Vincentius Lirinensis, "that which was always and everywhere believed by all, that's the rule of faith;" and therefore there can be no new measure, no new article, no new determination, no declaration obliging us to believe any proposition that was not always believed. And therefore, as that which was first

is true, that which was at first, and nothing else, is necessary.—*Ibid.* p. 446.

Next to this analogy or proportion of faith, let the consent of the Catholic Church be your measure, so as by no means to prevaricate in any doctrine in which all Christians always have consented. This will appear to be a necessary rule by and by; but in the mean time I shall observe to you, that it will be the safer because it cannot go far; it can be instanced but in three things—in the Creed, in Ecclesiastical Government, and in external forms of Worship and Liturgy. The Catholic Church hath been too much and too soon divided but in things *simply necessary* God hath preserved us still unbroken. All nations and all ages recite the Creed, and all pray the LORD's Prayer; and all pretend to walk by the rule of the commandments; and all Churches have ever kept the day of CHRIST's resurrection, or the LORD's day, holy; and all Churches have been governed by Bishops; and the rites of Christianity have been for ever administered by separate orders of men, and these men have always been set apart by prayer and the imposition of the Bishop's hands; and all Christians have been baptized; and all baptized persons were, or ought to be, and were taught that they should be, confirmed by the Bishops and Presidents of Religion; and for ever there were public forms of prayer, more or less in all Churches; and all Christians that were to enter into holy wedlock, were ever joined or blessed by the Bishop or the Priest. In these things all Christians ever have consented; and he that shall prophesy or expound Scripture to the prejudice of any of these things, hath no part in that article of the Creed, he does not believe the holy Catholic Church, he hath no fellowship, no communion with the saints and servants of God.

The consent
of the Ca-
tholic
Church
should be
our measure
of doctrine.

It is not here intended that the doctrine of the Church should be the rule of faith, *distinctly from*, much less *against* the Scripture; for that were a contradiction, to suppose the Church of God, and yet speaking and acting against the will of God; but it means that where the question is concerning an obscure place of Scripture, the practice of

the Catholic Church is the best commentary. “Intellectus qui cum praxi concurrit, est SPIRITUS vivificans,” said Cusanus. Then we speak according to the SPIRIT of GOD when we understand Scripture in that sense in which the Church of GOD hath always practised it. “Quod pluribus, quod sapientibus, quod omnibus videtur;” that’s Aristotle’s rule, and it is a rule of Nature. Every thing puts on a degree of probability as it is witnessed by wise men, by many wise men, by all wise men; and it is Vincentius Lirinensis’s great rule of truth; “quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus;” and he that goes against what is said *always*, and *everywhere*, and *by all* Christians, had need of a new revelation or an infallible spirit, or he hath an intolerable pride and foolishness of presumption. Out of the communion of the Universal Church no man can be saved; they are the body of CHRIST, and the whole Church cannot perish, and CHRIST cannot be a head without a body; and He will for ever be our REDEEMER, and for ever intercede for His Church, and be glorious in His saints; and he that does not sow in these furrows, but leaves the way of the whole Church, *hath no pretence for his error, no excuse for his pride, and will find no alleviation of his punishment*,¹—*Sermon on Tit. ii. 7. Sermons. Fol. 1673.*

COSIN, BISHOP.

B. 1549. D. 1672.

The Anglican Church has continued the old Religion.

In truth we have continued the old religion; and the ceremonies which we have taken from them that were before us, are not things which belong to this or that sect,

¹ Bishop JEBB observes, with reference to the above extract, that the rule of St. Vincent “has been unreservedly acknowledged as a just and true guide, by Bishop Taylor, in one of his latest works, the Visitation Sermon at Connor; a tribute, this last, the more remarkable, because in his Liberty of Prophesying, and in his Ductor Dubitantium, he had spoken less respectfully of the principles; and his remarkable change of language can be accounted for only by his having undergone a correspondent change of sentiment. He had seen, felt, and weighed every difficulty; the result of all was a deliberate persuasion that Vincentius was right, and that he himself had been wrong.”—*Letter to Dr. Nash. Foster’s Life, &c. of Bishop Jebb. Vol. II. p. 249.*

but they are the ancient rites and customs of the Church of CHRIST; whereof ourselves being a part, we have the selfsame interest in them which our fathers before us had, from whom the same descended to us. To abrogate those things without constraint of apparent harm thence arising, had been to alter unjustly the universal practice of the people of GOD, and those general decrees of the Fathers, which (in St. Augustine's language) is madness and insolence to do, both in respect to the universal authority of the Church, which no particular Church has power to control, and also in regard of reasons before mentioned.—*Preface to the Notes on the Common Prayer*, p. 50, in *Nicholls's Commentary*.

If the Roman Catholics would make the essence of their Church (as we do ours) to consist in the following points, we are at accord with them: in the reception and belief of the unanimous and general consent of the ancient Catholic Fathers, and the Universal Church of CHRIST in the interpretation of the holy Scriptures, and the collection of all necessary matters of faith from them, during the first six centuries downwards to our own day.—*Judgment betwixt the Church of England and Church of Rome*.¹

The Catholic interpretation of Scripture received by the Church of England.

THORNDIKE, PRIEST.

D. 1672.

And by this means I make account, I have gained another principle towards the interpretation of Scripture, and resolution of things questioned in Christianity, either concerning the rule of faith, or such laws and customs, determining the circumstances of Ecclesiastical Communion, as are understood by the name of Apostolical traditions; which principle, that no man mistake me, pretends not to any general rule for the interpretation of Scripture, even in those things which concern the rule of faith; but infers a presumption against any thing that can be alleged out of

How the Tradition of the Church limits the interpretation of Scripture.

¹ See *Catena Patrum*, No. III. p. 46.

Scripture, that if it may appear to be *contrary* to that which the *whole* Church hath received and held from *the beginning*, it *cannot be the true meaning* of that Scripture which is alleged to prove it.

The Catholic
Church
infallible.

The rule of faith consists partly in things to be believed, partly in things to be done. He that holds so much of Christian truth as may reasonably certify him of all that is requisite to qualify a Christian man for remission of sins and life everlasting, which are the promises of the Gospel, may well be said to hold the whole rule of faith in things to be believed. He that holds so much of Christian truth, as may reasonably certify him of all that is requisite to preserve all Christians with consciences void of sin, may be said to hold it in things to be done. For the common rule of faith importeth not what is necessary for *any* [one] Christian, but for *all* Christians. And that any thing contrary to the salvation of all Christians should be held and professed by all Christians, is a gross contradiction to common sense. Whereupon it is no less evidently true, that *the Catholic Church of all ages and all places is utterly infallible*; inasmuch as it is a gross contradiction, to suppose a number of men to attain salvation, who all do hold something destructive to the salvation of any one. So much difference there is between the whole Church, which is the Catholic Church of all times and places, and the present Catholic Church, respectively to those ages, in which the communion of the whole was not interrupted by any breach, but effectuated by actual correspondence. For, the act of the Catholic Church, in this sense, which I call the present Church, if it be lawful, obligeth all that are of it; *but itself stands obliged to the faith of the whole Church*, as that which the being and privilege of a Church presupposeth to be professed by it. And of this I cannot conceive how any question should remain. The difficulty that remains is, how it may appear, that all this is not a fine nothing, how it may reasonably seem to signify something towards the limitation which I prescribe to the interpretation of those Scriptures which may be alleged

in matter concerning the rule of faith. And the answer is, that, seeing it hath appeared that the Apostles of our LORD CHRIST established from the beginning one Catholic Church, consisting of all Churches, by the will of GOD and His appointment; (and that, in consideration of that which was made to appear before, that all things necessary to the salvation of all Christians, though evidently extant and discernible in the Scriptures, are *not nevertheless evidently discernible by all them whose salvation they concern*) that therefore the unity and communion of the Catholic Church was provided by GOD, as the depository of His truth, the acknowledgment whereof should be necessary to obtain life everlasting. So that the effect of this trust, deposited by GOD in the Church, might be at least thus much; that whatsoever was advanced in any part thereof as belonging to the rule of faith, being condemned where first it was advanced, and in consequence of that condemnation, by all other parts of the Church, to that effect as to render those that held it incapable of the communion of all the whole Church,—that this, I say, might be accounted a reasonable mark, to discern such doctrine to be destructive to the rule of faith. And thus were all Heresies marked for such by the Church, not only before Constantine, but so long as it may be visible that nothing hindered this correspondence, wherein the actual unity of the Church consisted, to operate and have effect. For, if this be the reason and ground which made these marks reasonable, as grounded upon it, then he that supposes this reason either actually interrupted or impeached, cannot presume upon the like effect. And therefore the justifying of these marks requires the evidencing of this correspondence of the Church, and no more. And the whole reason for which the testimonies of ecclesiastical writers is receivable, to evidence matters concerning the rule of faith, (to which they can give no credit, but are, by acknowledging the same, receivable for Christians) is the communion of the Church, which make it evident, that what such men profess in the Church, is not against the faith of the Church.

How the declaration of the Church becomes a reasonable mark of heresy.

That which
is not found
in the Scrip-
tures may
yet have
been deli-
vered by the
Apostles.

Besides this, another presumption or prescription, limiting the interpretation of Scriptures to such things as concern the traditions of the Apostles, we may be confident to have gained from the society of the Church, demonstrated by the premises; to wit, that if any thing be questionable, whether it come by Tradition from the Apostles or not, there can no conclusion be made in the negative, because it is not expressed in the Scriptures. Here I desire all them that will not mistake me, to take notice, that I intend not here to conclude, or infer, what *force* those traditions, which I pretend may come from the Apostles (though it be not certified by the Scriptures), may have to oblige the Church; but that which I here affirm only concerns the question of fact, that it is not impossible to make evidence, that some Orders, or Rites, or Customs of the Church had their beginning of being brought in for laws to the Church by the Apostles, though *not* written in the Scriptures.

St Augus-
tine's test of
Apostolical
Traditions.

The rule of St. Austin, how to discern what traditions do indeed come from the Apostles, is well enough known to be this: to wit, that which is observed over all the Church, though it cannot be discerned when, where, or by whom it came first in force (that is, in his times, by the authority of what synod it was settled), that must be deemed and taken to come from the authority of the Apostles themselves. I will not use the terms of synod or synods, because I conceive the Church was from the beginning, by virtue of the perpetual intelligence and correspondence settled and used between the parts of it, a standing Synod, even when there was no assembly of persons authorized to consent in behalf of their respective Churches; such things as became requisite to be determined in any Church being thereby so communicated to the rest, as the order taken in one, either to be accepted by them or redressed. Neither will I say that the rule is so effectual as it is true; for I cannot warrant how general the practice of every thing that may come in question can appear to have been over the whole Church, nor whether it may appear to have begun from some act of the Church, to be designed by some place or persons, or not; which in St. Austin's time, I doubt not,

might be made to appear, and being made to appear, would maintain the rule to be true. Nor have I need of any such rule, as may serve to discern whatsoever may become questionable, whether it come from the Apostles themselves or not: it shall suffice me here to presume thus much, that *no man can prescribe against any rule of the Church, that it comes not from the Apostles, because it is not recorded in the holy Scriptures*; and, therefore, that nothing hindereth competent evidence to be made of the authority of the Apostles, in some orders of the Church, of which there is no mention in the Scriptures. Correspondently to that which was settled afore concerning the rule of faith, that no man can prescribe against any thing questionable, that it is no part of it, because it is not evident in Scripture; or because such arguments may be made against it out of the Scriptures, which every one, whose salvation it concerns, is not able evidently to assail. And, all this being determined, I intend nevertheless that it still shall remain questionable, how far these orders of the Apostles oblige the Church; because I intend not to prescribe from all this, that those orders which shall appear to have been brought in by the Apostles may not become useless to the Church.

These things being said, we have got ground for a resolution, in the dispute concerning the authority of the Fathers in matters questionable concerning Christianity, and the interpretation of the Scriptures. For truly did the credit of those things which they affirm consist in the reputation of their holiness and learning: whether or no the premises be true, the consequence would be lame. He that could make a question of the godliness and of the Christianity of those persons, to whom we owe the maintenance and propagation of Christianity under God (by preserving CHRIST'S flock from the contagion of Heresies, by entertaining the unity of the Church, and by laying down their lives for the truth), must by consequence question, though not that Christianity which he hath fancied, yet that which was delivered by the Apostles; which, notwithstanding, if the HOLY GHOST, that was in them to save them, by saving the common Christianity, hath not given the Church evidence,

Of the Fathers of the Church.

that He was given them to preserve them from error in understanding the Scriptures, we wrong them, and the HOLY GHOST in them, if we take the truth of their doctrine upon their credit. For, though the having of the HOLY GHOST presupposeth the profession of Christianity, as I have showed, yet that importeth no evidence to warrant the truth of *all* that they might say in defence or interpretation of it.

Two privileges there are belonging to the Fathers of the Church, which no man that writes in these days can pretend to, how godly, how learned soever he may be. The first is that of their age and time, *creating an infallible trust, in point of historical truth, concerning the state of Christianity during those ages in which they lived, or which they might know.* This is that, which neither Pagans, nor Jews, nor Mahometans, can refuse them, any more than Christians can refuse to believe them in matters of *fact*, which they relate, not as things done in private, (which themselves, with a few more, may pretend to have had means to know) but which were visible to the world at such time as they writ; and wherein, had they been otherwise, they might have been reprov'd, as imposing upon the world, not the belief of that which doth not appear to be true, but of that which doth appear to be untrue. Neither do I demand, that upon this score, their credit be admitted any further, than that which I have premised will enforce. For, if I have well concluded, that the Church is a society instituted by our LORD CHRIST and His Apostles, in trust, for the maintenance and propagation of Christianity, contained in the holy Scriptures which He deposited with it; then is the sense of that time which is nearest the age of the Apostles, a legal presumption of the truth of that which it was trusted with. And as all writers, that relate things subject to the sense of all men as well as their own, have the credit of historical truth, and Church writers, in matters of fact concerning the Church of their respective ages; (the state thereof being always visible;) so those that write under the first ages of the Church, though competent authors for the

truth of nothing in Christianity, (for then why should not Christianity be believed upon their credit?) yet must be admitted, *as unquestionable witnesses of that Christianity, which came hot and tender from the forge of our LORD and His Apostles.*¹ Nor do I complain that any man refuses them upon this score. But when I see how many, pretending to search the Scriptures, and the truth of things questioned in Christianity, never make use of any information they might have from them, to argue thereupon the true sense of the Scriptures, (who, if they were to expound any author of human learning, would count him a madman that should neglect the records of those authors that lived nearest the same time, and perhaps do them-

¹ "Supposing the Primitive Fathers to have been men of only common discernment and integrity, their testimony respecting the doctrines then actually received by the Church, and maintained against the heresies then prevailing, must have peculiar weight. Those among them who had been personally conversant with the Apostles, and who derived their knowledge of the Christian faith from what they continually heard of their preaching and discourse, as well as from their writings, seem to have claim to a regard only short of that which was due to their inspired preceptors. To place such men as Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, no higher in the scale of authority, with respect to the value of their testimony on these points, than Bishops and Pastors in later times, betrays an error of judgment, which, on any other subject of investigation analogous to this, would be deemed preposterous. Disclaiming, therefore, any superstitious reverence towards these venerable men, it may reasonably be urged, that their peculiarly advantageous circumstances demand especial consideration; and that unless their characters, both moral and intellectual, could be so sufficiently impeached as to prove them wholly unworthy of credit, their *testimony* is of the *very first importance* in ascertaining the primitive faith. . . . If, in addition to these special grounds of confidence in the early Fathers, we admit, what has been contended for by learned and judicious divines, that the extraordinary gifts of the SPIRIT, (especially that of 'discerning spirits,') were not entirely withdrawn from the Church till long after the time of the Apostles; this would give still stronger confirmation to their claims. For though we should not be warranted in a supposition that even these extraordinary gifts conferred authority for promulgating new articles of faith, or infringing on any exclusive prerogative of the sacred writers, yet it would go far towards establishing *interpretations* of Christian doctrine thus received and sanctioned, on a firmer basis than any in which their less gifted successors can ground their pretensions."—Bp. Van Mildert's *Bampton Lectures. Sermon V.* See also a Letter on the "Exclusive Power of Episcopally-ordained Clergy to administer the Word and Sacraments." pp. 10, 11.

selves employ the writings of Jews and Pagans in expounding the very Scriptures,) I cannot choose but take it as a mark of prejudice against some truth, that men care not to be informed of the primitive Christianity, lest consequences might be framed against some prejudices of their own, which, supposing only the credit of historical truth, might prove undeniable. The second consideration, in which the writings of the Fathers are valuable, cometh from that which is now proved, that is, from the society of the Church, and the unity thereof; from whence it follows, that what is found to be taught in the Church by men authorized by the communion thereof, and qualified to teach, and that without contradiction, is not contrary to the rule of faith; but if it be taught with one consent, it is part of it. *Without contradiction*, I mean here, when a man is not charged to transgress the faith of the Church, in that which he teacheth, much less disowned by the Church for teaching it. Not, when no man is found to hold a contrary opinion, which always falls out in things disputable. For the communion of the Church necessarily importeth, that a man qualified with authority in it, profess nothing contrary to that faith, the profession whereof qualifies all to be of the Church: though other things there may be many, wherein a man may be allowed not only to believe, but to profess contrary to that which another professes, and yet qualified, not only to be of the Church, but to bear that authority which the society thereof constituteth. The name, therefore, of *Fathers* importeth at least some part of that superiority, which the society of the Church giveth; and therefore belongeth not properly to those that are not so qualified, though they that are not so qualified, may be the authors of such writings as have the lot to remain to posterity. But the authority of Fathers, which is grounded upon this presumption, that persons qualified in the Church teach nothing contrary to the faith of it, because their quality in the Church would become questionable if they should teach that which agrees not with the faith of the Church; this authority, I say, cannot appear in the writings of

private Christians; because the Church is no further chargeable, by allowing him the communion of the Church, who declareth to believe only that which indeed contradicts the rule of faith, than of taking no notice what a private man professes to think, out of that ignorance which may beseeem a capacity of being better informed.—*An Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England.* Book I. c. xxi. xxii. Edit. 1659.

I may now proceed, I conceive, to resolve generally, upon what principles any thing questionable in Christianity is determinable; and as frankly as briefly do affirm that there are but two sorts of means to resolve us in any thing of that nature: Tradition and Argument, Authority and Reason, History and Logic. For whatsoever any artist or divine hath said, of the great use of the languages, in discovering the true meaning of the original Scriptures, by the ancient translations as well as the originals (which I allow as much as they demand); they must give me leave to observe, that, seeing all languages are certain laws of speaking, which have the force of signifying by being delivered to posterity upon agreement of their predecessors, all that help is duly ascribed to Tradition, which we have from the languages. Indeed this is no tradition of the Church, no more than all history and historical truth, concerning the times, the places, the persons mentioned in the Scripture, concerning the laws, the customs, the fashions, and orders practised by persons mentioned in the Scriptures in all particulars whereof the Scripture speaks; which, whether it be delivered by Christians or not Christians, as far as the common reason of men alloweth or warranteth it for historical truth, is to be admitted into consequence, in inquiring the meaning of the Scriptures; and without it, all pretence of languages is pedantic and contemptible, as that which gives the true reason to the language of the Scripture, whatsoever it import in vulgar use. This help being applied to the text of Scripture, it will be of consequence to consider the process of the discourse, pursuing that which may appear to be intended,

Two sorts
of means to
resolve
whatsoever
is resolvable
concerning
the Scrip-
tures.

not by any man's fancy, but by those marks which, cleared by the helps premised, may appear to signify it, which is the work of reason, supposing the truth of the Scriptures. And whereas other passages of Scripture either are clearer of themselves, or, being made clearer by using the same helps, may seem to argue the meaning of that which is questioned: whereas, other parts of Christianity resolved afore, may serve as principles to infer, by consequence of reason, the truth of that which remains in doubt (not to be imputed therefore to reason, but to the truth from which reason argues, as believed and not seen), this also is no less the work of reason, supposing the truth of the Scriptures. But whereas there be two sorts of things questionable in Christianity; and all that is questionable merely in point of truth, hath relation to, and dependance upon the rule of faith, as consequent to it, or consistent with it, if we will have it true; or otherwise, if false. I acknowledge, in the first place, that nothing of this nature can be questionable, further than as some Scripture, the meaning whereof is not evident, createth the doubt; and therefore, that the determination of the meaning of that Scripture, is the determination of the truth questionable. For, seeing the truth of God's nature and counsels, which Christianity revealeth, are things which no Christian can pretend to have known, otherwise than by revelation from God; and that we have evidence, that whatsoever we have by Scripture, is revealed, but, by the Tradition of the Church, no further than all the Church agreeth in it; (all that wherein it agreeth, being supposed to be in the Scripture, and much more than that,) it followeth that nothing can be affirmed as consequent to, or consistent with, that which the Tradition of the Church containeth, but by the Scripture, and from the Scripture. So that I willingly admit whatsoever is alleged from divers sayings of the Fathers, that whatsoever is not proved out of Scripture, is as easily rejected as it is affirmed, limiting the meaning of it as I have said. But, whatsoever there is Scripture produced to prove, seeing we have prescribed that *nothing can be admitted for the true meaning of any*

Scripture that is against the Catholic Tradition of the Church; it behoveth that evidence be made, that what is pretended to be true, hath been taught in the Church so expressly, as may infer the allowance of it, and therefore is not against the rule of faith.—An Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England. Book I. c. xxiv.

BARROW, PRIEST AND DOCTOR.

B. 1630. D. 1677.

As in all cases it is our duty to defer much regard to the opinion of our [spiritual] Guides, so, in some cases, it behoveth us to rely barely upon their judgment and advice; those, especially, among them who excel in dignity and worth, who are approved for wisdom and integrity; their definitions, or the declarations of their opinion, (especially such as are exhibited upon mature deliberation and debate, in a solemn manner,) are ever very probable arguments of truth and expediency; they are commonly the best arguments which can be had in some matters, especially to the meaner and simpler sort of people.

Of the
respect due
to our
spiritual
Guides.

It is evident to experience, that every man is not capable to judge, or able to guide himself in matters of this nature (concerning divine truth and conscience). There are *children in understanding*; there are men *weak in faith* (or knowledge concerning the faith); there are *idiots, ἄκοκοι*, (men not bad, but *simple*,) persons *occupying the room of the unlearned, unskilful in the word of righteousness*, who, as the Apostle saith, “need that one should teach them which be the first principles of the oracles of God.”

The vulgar sort of men are as undiscerning and injudicious in all things, so peculiarly in matters of this nature, so much abstracted from common sense and experience; whence we see them easily seduced into the fondest conceits and wildest courses, by any slender artifice or fair pretence, “like children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive.”

There are also some particular cases, a competent information and skill in which must depend upon improvement of mind acquired by more than ordinary study and experience; so that in them most people do want sufficient means of attaining knowledge requisite to guide their judgment or their practice; and for such persons, in such cases, it is plainly the best, the wisest, and the safest way, to rely upon the direction of their Guides, assenting to what they declare, acting what they prescribe, going whither they conduct.—*First Sermon on Heb. xiii. 17. Works, Vol. III. pp. 329—331. Oxford: 1830.*

Anti Catho-
lic Teachers
not to be
regarded.

It can, indeed, no wise be safe to follow any such leaders, (whatever pretences to special illumination they hold forth, whatever specious guises of sanctity they bear,) who in their doctrine or practice deflect from the great beaten roads of holy Scripture, *primitive Tradition*, and Catholic practice, roving in bye-paths suggested to them by their *private fancies* and humours, their passions and lusts, their interests and advantages. There have, in all ages, such counterfeit guides started up, having debauched some few heedless persons, having erected some *παρὰ συνάγωγας*, or petty combinations, against the regularly settled corporations; but never with any durable success or countenance of Divine Providence; but like prodigious meteors, having caused a little gazing (Jude, ver. 13), and some disturbance, their sects have soon been dissipated, and have quite vanished away, the authors and abettors of them being either buried in oblivion, or recorded with ignominy; like that Theudas, in the speech of Gamaliel (Acts v. 36), who “rose up boasting himself to be somebody; to whom a number of men, about four hundred, joined themselves, who were slain, and all as many as obeyed him were scattered and brought to nought.”—*Ibid.* pp. 291, 292.

The Fathers
most helpful
interpreters
of the
Scriptures.

The ancient writers living near the apostolical times, and being immediately (or within a few degrees mediately) their disciples, may justly be supposed *most helpful towards*

informing us what was their genuine doctrine, what the true sense of their writings.—Second Sermon on Heb. xiii. 17. Works, p. 334.

ALLESTREE, PRIEST.

B. 1619. D. 1680.

For him that shall affirm all necessities that must make us “wise unto salvation” are not in the Scripture, ’tis impossible to give a rational account how it should come to pass that some are there, the rest are not. The sufficiency of Scripture.

It must be either on design, or else by chance. Now, 1. That God should design, when very many things that were not necessary were to be written, that the main and fundamental ones should be omitted; and when of the necessities, most He did design for Scripture; then He should not suffer the Apostles to write the remainder of them: and yet, what He would not suffer them to write, designed that the Trent Fathers (who, I hope, have perfected the catalogue) should write all. Of these, since it is not possible to give a reason, it is not, therefore, rational to affirm it was upon design. But, 2. If he shall say it only happened so by chance, he does affront both Scriptures and GOD’S HOLY SPIRIT, Who, as they affirm, inspired them for this very end—to bring men to the faith and to salvation. But there is no place for chance, in those things which are done in order to an end, by the design, impulse, and motion of the infinite wisdom of GOD’S HOLY SPIRIT. He certainly does most unworthily reproach his Maker, who can think it possible, that what He did design expressly and on that account alone to attain such an end by (namely, that men should believe and be saved), and inspire it for that purpose, should yet fail, not be sufficient for that purpose. And sure if it be sufficient it contains all necessities, otherwise it were deficient in the main; yea so clearly also, as that they for whose salvation they are intended, may, with use of such methods, as are obvious and agreed upon by all men, understand them; for otherwise they could not

Explica-
tions of
Scripture
are much
confirmed
by the pro-
fession of
the Catholic
Church.

be sufficient; if men could not be instructed by them in things both to faith and life, they could not “make them wise unto salvation.” I must confess the Scripture labours under a great prejudice against this doctrine, from the different sense and interpretations that are made of it, even in the most fundamental points, by them that grant it is the Word of God; when yet all use the same means to find out the meaning, and no doubt they seek sincerely after it. But yet I think it evident this happens not from the obscurity of Scripture, since it is not only in the most express texts, but also, if you should suppose the doctrines were as plainly set down there as words can express them, yet there are such principles assumed into the faith of different sects, as must oblige them to interpret diversely the same plain words. I am not so vain as to imagine that no places are obscure in Scripture; and I know that learned men have arts, by obscure places, to confound the plainest, just as the philosopher did motion. *Neither am I so perverse and singular not to think that universal practice and profession of the Church does much assure and confirm explications of Scripture, whether obscure or plain.* But this I say, that the diversities of explication come, as I now said, from the diversity of principles, or rather prejudices.—*Sermon on 2 Tim. iii. 15. Sermons. Fol. 1684, pp. 11, 12.*

SPARROW, BISHOP.

D. 1685.

The autho-
rity of the
Church.

Then the legislative of making laws and constitutions for regulating manners, and *determining doubts and controversies*, it cannot with reason be denied to be granted in that large commission forecited (St. John xx. 21): *As my Father sent me, so send I you.* For here, committing the government of the Church to His Apostles, our LORD commissions them with the same power that was committed to Him for that purpose when He was on earth, with the same necessary standing power that He had and exercised as Man for the good of the Church. Less cannot in reason

be thought to be here granted, than all power necessary for the well and peaceable government of the Church; and such power is this of making laws. Then, in particular, for making Articles, and *decisions of doctrines controverted*, the power is more explicit and express (*St. Matt. xxviii. 18, 19*): *All power is given to Me, go therefore and teach all nations*; that is, with authority, and by virtue of that power that is given to Me. And what is it to teach the truth with authority, but to command and oblige all people to receive the truth so taught? And this power was not given to the Apostles' *persons* only, for CHRIST there promised to be with them in that *Office* to the *end of the world*, that is, to them and their Successors in the Pastoral Office, to the Apostles or Bishops that should succeed them to the end of the world. This will appear still more clear by St. Paul (*Heb. xiii. 17*), where, after he had commanded them not to be carried about with divers and strange doctrines, he prescribes this as the preservative against such errors and inconstancy: *Obey them that have the oversight over you, and watch for your souls*; obey them in the guidance and conduct of your souls, in their determinations and decisions about such divers and strange doctrines; all which supposes in those Guides a power to govern and rule us in such doubts and controversies about doctrines and matters of belief, an *authority to determine in controversies of faith*, as our Church teaches in her Twentieth Article. Add to this, that St. Paul tells us (*1 Tim. iii. 15*) that the Church is the *ground and pillar of truth*. And whither then should we go, in doubts and controversies, for the determination of what is truth, but to the ground and pillar of truth? For the clearer understanding of this power in the Church, know that to this one holy Church our LORD committed in trust the most holy faith, and the whole stock of necessary Christian truth, therefore called the ground and pillar of truth. This truth she must endeavour to preserve, as by stopping the mouths of obstinate gainsayers, so by guiding and governing the meek, but weak doubters, into the truth, by determining their doubts and controversies. *Not that the Church can make articles of faith and obtrude them upon the*

members, but that she may and MUST (if the true sense of faith and holy Scriptures be called in question), *declare and determine what that sense is which she hath received in trust from CHRIST and His Apostles, commanding, under penalties and censures, all her children to receive that sense, and to profess it in such expressive words and form as may directly determine the doubts.* Thus she did in the great NICENE Council, venerable over all the Christian world: when the Arians had perverted, by subtle controversies and questions, the true sense of the Creed concerning our SAVIOUR's divinity, she first declared what sense of the Creed *she had received by constant Tradition from the Apostles;* and then enjoined all Christians to profess that sense by the word *ὁμοούσιος*, of the same substance with the FATHER,—a word directly determining the controversy in hand. Nor did the Christian world ever question her authority in this particular. And in controversies about doctrines, where she hath received *no such clear determination of either part from CHRIST and His Apostles,* she hath power to declare her own sense in the controversy, and to determine which part shall be received and professed for truth by her members, and that too under ecclesiastical penalty and censure; which they accordingly are bound to submit to, *not as an infallible verity, but as a probable truth,* and rest in her determination, till it be made plain by as great or a greater authority, that this her determination is an error: and if it shall appear to any of the members to be an error, or if they shall *think* it so to be by the weight of such reasons as are privately suggested to them, yet are they still obliged to silence and peace (where the decision of a particular Church is against the doctrine of the Universal), not to profess in this case against the Church's determination, because the professing of such a controverted truth is not necessary, but the preservation of the peace and unity of the Church is. This is not to assert infallibility in the Church, but *authority.* The sentence shall bind to submission, though the superiors may err in the sentence. Thus GOD ordered it (Deut. xvii.), that in doubts the inferior were to stand to the decision and sentence of the

priests and the Judge: and yet their judgment was not infallible; *πᾶσα συναγωγή*, the whole Assembly, the chiefest Senate might err, and sin through ignorance; and a sacrifice is appointed for the expiation of their error (Lev. iv. 13). Better that inferiors be bound to stand to such fallible judgment (as to quiet submission) in such kind of controversies as aforementioned, than that every man be suffered to interpret laws, and determine controversies, which will bring into the Church certain confusion. Nor will such submission in the inferiors be damnable, seeing in this submission to authority they follow God's methods (obeying them that have the oversight over them, Heb. xiii. 17), and keep order, of which God is the Author (1 Cor. xiv. 33). God is not the Author of confusion, but of order and peace, as in all the Churches of the saints.

This authority, in determining doubts and controversies, the Church hath practised in all ages, and her constant practice is the best interpreter of her right. We read not only of St. Paul's determining controversies about rites and circumstances (1 Cor. xiv.), but also of the Church's determining controversies of doctrines and matters of belief in a full Council (Acts xv.), and requiring submission to those determinations from inferior members. The like did the Church afterwards in her General Councils of NICE, CONSTANTINOPLE, EPHESUS, and CHALCEDON. And not only the General Councils have exercised this authority, but particular Churches also in National Councils—in the Council of ORANGE, MILEVIS, and others—have used the same power over their children, whom they were bound to teach and govern, and for whose souls they were to account to God; and they did no more than was their right, *so long as they did it with submission to the General Church to whom they are subject*. CHRIST said to the Apostles, and, by this, *to all the Guides* of souls that should succeed them in a lawful ordination, *He that hears you, hears ME, and he that despises you, despises ME*. (St. Cyp. Ep. 69.)—*Preface to his Collections*, 4to. 1671.

PEARSON, BISHOP AND DOCTOR.

B. 1612. D. 1686.

The Catholic Church has ever preserved the true faith.

As our religion is Catholic, it holdeth fast that “faith which was once delivered to the saints,” and since preserved in the Church; and therefore I expound such verities, in opposition to the heretics arising in all ages, especially against the Photinians, who, of all the rest, have most perverted the articles of our Creed, and found out followers in these latter ages, who have erected a new body of divinity in opposition to the Catholic theology. Against these I proceed upon such principles as they themselves allow, that is, upon the Word of God delivered in the Old and New Testament, alleged according to the true sense, and applied by right reason; not urging the authority of the Church which they reject, but only giving, in the margin, the sense of the Primitive Fathers, *for the satisfaction of such as have any respect left for antiquity, and are persuaded that CHRIST had a true Church on the earth before these times.*—*On the Creed.* Preface, pp. xix. xx. Oxf. 1833.

TILLOTSON, ARCHBISHOP.

B. 1630. D. 1694.

Holy Scripture the only standard of faith.

Whereas they [the Romanists] affirm, that Scripture alone is not the rule [i. e. *standard*] of Christian faith and practice; but that Scripture, and Oral Tradition preserved in the Church, and delivered down from hand to hand, makes up the entire rule. I would fain know whence they learned this new doctrine of the rule of faith? I know that the Council of Trent declares it for the rule they intend to proceed upon and make use of, for the confirmation and proof of their following determinations and decrees. But did any of the ancient Councils of the Christian Church lay down this rule, and proceed upon it? Did not Constantine, the Emperor, at the opening of the first General Council, lay

the Bible before them, as the only rule, according to which they were to proceed; and this with the approbation of all those holy Fathers that were assembled in that Council? And did not following Councils proceed upon the same rule? Do any of the ancient Fathers ever mention any rule of Christian faith and practice, besides the holy Scriptures, *and the ancient Creed*, which, because it is an abridgment of the necessary articles of Christian faith contained in the holy Scriptures, is by them frequently called *the rule of faith*? Do not the same Fathers frequently and expressly say, that the Scriptures are a perfect rule, and that all things are plainly contained in them which concern faith and life; and that whatever cannot be proved by testimony of Scripture is to be rejected? All this I am sure I can make good by innumerable express testimonies of the ancient Fathers, which are well known by those that are versed in them. By what authority then hath the Council of Trent set up this new Rule, unknown to the Christian Church for 1500 years? and who gave them this authority?—*Sixth Sermon on Heb. x. 23.*

I cannot but take notice of one thing, wherein our adversaries do perpetually glory, as a mighty advantage which they think they have over us in the point of the divinity of the SON of GOD, and consequently in that other point of the blessed TRINITY; namely, that they have reason clearly on their side in this controversy, and that the difficulties and absurdities are much greater and plainer on our part than on theirs. Here they are pleased to triumph without modesty and without measure; and yet, notwithstanding this, I am not afraid here likewise to join issue with them, and am contented to have this matter brought to a fair trial at the bar of reason, as well as of Scripture, *expounded by the general Tradition of the Christian Church*; I say, by *general Tradition*, which, next to Scripture, is the best and surest confirmation of this great point now in question between us, and that which gives us *the greatest and truest light for the right understanding of the true sense and meaning of Scripture, not only in this,*

Catholic
Tradition
the best In-
terpreter of
Scripture.

but in most other important doctrines of the Christian Religion.—Sermon XLIV. “Concerning the divinity of our blessed Lord.”

STILLINGFLEET, BISHOP AND DOCTOR.

B. 1635. D. 1699.

The sense
of the Primi-
tive Church
the best
Interpreter
of Scripture.

Where the sense [of the New Testament] seems doubtful, and disputes have been raised about it, inquire into the sense of the Christian Church in the first ages, as the best Interpreter of Scripture; as, whether the Apostles left Bishops or Presbyters to succeed them in the government of Churches; whether the Apostles appointed the LORD's day to be observed as the day of public worship; whether baptism were not to be administered to infants as well as circumcision, both being seals of God's Covenant; whether divine worship doth not belong to CHRIST, and were not given to Him in the hymns and doxologies of the Primitive Church; and, whether divine worship can be given to any creature; whether the form of baptism was not understood so as to imply a TRINITY of Persons; and, whether all true Christians were not baptized into this faith, and consequently, whether denying the TRINITY be not renouncing Christian baptism. These, and many other such questions of great importance, receive great light from the writings of the first ages.—*Of the Duties and Rights of the Parochial Clergy. Works, Fol. 1709, Vol. III. pp. 659, 660.*

Ibid.

The Church of England doth very piously declare her consent with the ancient Catholic Church, in not admitting any thing to be delivered as the sense of Scripture which is contrary to the consent of the Catholic Church in the four first ages. Not as though the sense of the Catholic Church were pretended to be any infallible rule of interpreting Scripture in all things which concern the rule of faith, but that it is a sufficient prescription against any thing which can be alleged out of Scripture, that if it

appear contrary to the sense of the Catholic Church from the beginning, it ought not to be looked on as the true meaning of the Scripture. All this security is built upon this strong presumption, that nothing contrary to the necessary Articles of faith should be held by the Catholic Church, whose very being depends upon the belief of those things which are necessary to salvation. As long, therefore, as the Church might appear to be truly Catholic by those correspondencies which were maintained between the several parts of it, that what was refused by one was so by all, so long this unanimous uncontradicted sense of the Catholic Church ought to have a great sway upon the minds of such who yet profess themselves members of the Catholic Church. From whence it follows, that such doctrines may well be judged destructive to the rule of faith, which were so unanimously condemned by the Catholic Church within that time. And thus much may suffice for the first inquiry, *viz.* What things are to be esteemed necessary, either in order to Salvation, or in order to Ecclesiastical Communion.—*Grounds of Protestant Religion*, Part I. c. ii. *Works*, Vol. IV. pp. 57, 58.

Let it suffice to tell you, that we believe no Article of faith upon the Church's *infallible authority*; and, therefore, though we deny what the Church proposeth, it follows not that we are any more liable to question the truth of any Article any farther than the Church's authority reaches in it; *i. e.* we deny that any thing becomes an Article *merely upon her account*. But, now, if you remove the argument from the *present Church's infallible authority* to the *universal Church's testimony*, we then tell you, that he who questions a clear, full, universal Tradition of the whole Church, from CHRIST's time to this, will, by the same reason, doubt of *all matters of faith, which are conveyed by this testimony to us*. But then we must farther consider, that we are bound by the Church's testimony to believe nothing any farther than it appears to have been the *constant, full, universal* testimony of the Church, from the time of CHRIST and His Apostles. Whatever, therefore,

We believe nothing upon the present Church's infallible authority, but we submit in all things to the universal Church's testimony.

you can make appear to have been received as a necessary Article of faith *in this manner*, we embrace it, but nothing else; and, on the other side, we say, that whoever doubts or denies *this* testimony, will doubt of all matters of faith, because the ground and rule of faith,¹ the Scriptures, is conveyed to us *only* through this *universal Tradition*.—*Grounds, &c. c. iii. Works, Vol. IV. p. 88.*

We submit
in all things
to the testi-
mony of the
Catholic
Church.

We appeal to the doctrine and practice of the truly Catholic Church, in the matters of difference between us and the Church of Rome. We are as ready as they to stand to the unanimous consent of Fathers, and to Vincentius Lirinensis, his rules of *Antiquity, Universality, and Consent*; we declare, let the things in dispute be proved to have been the practice of the Christian Church in all ages, *we are ready to submit to them*; but those who separate from the Church of England make this their fundamental principle as to worship (wherein the difference lies), that nothing is lawful in the worship of God but what He hath *expressly commanded*; we say all things are lawful which are *not forbidden*, and upon this single point stands the whole controversy of separation as to the constitution of our Church. We challenge those who separate from us to produce one person for fifteen hundred years together, that held forms of prayer to be unlawful, or the ceremonies which are used in our Church. We defend the government of the Church by Bishops to be the most ancient and apostolical government, and that no person can have sufficient reason to cast that off, which hath been so universally received in all ages since the Apostles' times. If there have been disputes among us about the nature of the difference between the two orders, and the necessity of it in order to the being of a Church, such there have been in the Church of Rome too. Here lies a very considerable difference, *we appeal and are ready to stand to the judgment of the Primitive Church for interpreting the letter of Scripture*, in any difference between us and the

¹ Here is another instance of "*Ground*" and "*Rule*" being used as synonymous terms with reference to holy Scripture.

Church of Rome; but those who separate from our Church will allow nothing to be lawful but what hath an express command in Scripture.—“*Answer to the Book entituled ‘Dr. Stillingfleet’s Principles considered,’*” p. 68. *Works*, Vol. V.

We grant there can be no certainty as to the copies of Scripture but from Tradition, and if you can name any of those great things in controversy between us, which you will undertake to prove to be as universal a tradition as that of the Scriptures, you and I shall not differ as to the belief of it. But think not to fob us off with the tradition of the *present* Church, instead of the Church of all ages, with the tradition of *your* Church instead of the Catholic, with the ambiguous testimonies of two or three of the Fathers, instead of the *universal consent of the Church since the Apostles’ times*. If I should once see you prove the Infallibility of your Church, the Pope’s Supremacy, Invocation of Saints, Veneration of Images, the necessity of Coelibate in the Clergy, a punitive Purgatory, &c. (to name no more), by as *unquestionable* and *universal* a tradition as that whereby we receive the Scriptures, I shall extol you for the only person who ever did any thing considerable on your side, and I shall willingly yield myself up as a trophy to your brave attempts.—*Grounds, &c.* c. vii. *Works*, Vol. IV. p. 209.

That we would receive *any* doctrine in controversy between us and Rome upon as universal a tradition as that of the Scriptures.

That is all which is meant by saying, That the present Church is infallible in fundamentals, *viz.* That there shall always be a Church, for that which makes them a Church, is the belief of fundamentals.—*Grounds of Protestant Religion*, Part I. c. viii. *Works*, Vol. IV. p. 243.

The Catholic Church indefectible in fundamentals.

The authority of Guides in the Church is not absolute and unlimited, but confined within certain bounds, which, if they transgress, they are no longer to be followed. So St. Paul saith, (Gal. i. 8,) “If we, or an angel from Heaven, teach any other Gospel, let him be accursed;” so that the Apostles themselves, though giving the greatest evidence

Of the authority of our spiritual Guides.

of infallibility, were no longer to be followed, than they held to the Gospel of CHRIST. And they desired no more of their greatest disciples whom they had converted to the Christian faith, than to be "followers of them as they were of CHRIST" (1 Cor. ii. 1); they told them, "they had no dominion over their faith," (2 Cor. i. 14,) although they were far more assisted by an infallible SPIRIT, than any other Guides of the Church could pretend to be ever since. Therefore no present Guides, whatever names they go by, ought to usurp such an authority over the minds of men which the Apostles themselves did not challenge; although there were greater reason for men to yield up their minds wholly to their guidance. We are far from denying all reasonable and just authority to be given to the Guides of the Church, but we say that their authority not being absolute is confined to some known rule; and where there is a rule for them to proceed by, there is a rule for others to judge of their proceedings; and consequently men must exercise their judgment about the matters they determine, whether they be agreeable to that rule or not.

Where the rule by which the Guides of the Church are to proceed hath determined nothing, there we say the authority of the Guides is to be submitted unto. For otherwise there would be nothing left wherein their authority *could* be shown, and others pay obedience to them on the account of it. Therefore we plead for the Church's authority in all matters of mere order and decency, in indifferent rites and ceremonies; and think it an unreasonable thing to debar the Governors of a Christian society the privilege of commanding in things which God hath not already determined by His own Law. We plead for the respect and reverence which is due to the lawful Constitutions of the Church whereof we are members; and assert the exercise of that power which is committed to the Governors of it as the Successors of the Apostles in their care of the Christian Church, although not in their infallibility.

We allow a great authority to the Guides of the Catholic Church in the best times of Christianity; and look upon

the concurrent sense of antiquity as an excellent means to understand the mind of Scripture in places otherwise doubtful and obscure. We profess a great reverence to the ancient Fathers of the Church, but especially when assembled in free and General Councils; we reject the ancient heresies condemned in them, which we the rather believe to be against the Scripture, because so ancient, so wise, and so great persons did deliver the contrary doctrine not only to be the sense of the Church in their own time, but ever since the Apostles. Nay, we reject nothing that can be proved by an *universal Tradition* from the Apostolical times downwards; but we have so great an opinion of the wisdom and piety of those excellent Guides of the Church in the primitive times, that we see no reason to have those things forced upon us *now*, which we offer to prove to be contrary to *their* doctrine and practice. So that the controversy between us, [the Anglican and Roman Churches,] is not about the authority of the Guides of the Church, but whether the Guides of the Apostolical and Primitive times, ought not to have greater authority over us than those of the present Church, in things wherein they *contradict* each other? This is the true state of the controversy between us; and all the clamours of rejecting the authority of Church Guides are vain and impertinent. But we profess to yield greater reverence and submission of mind to CHRIST and His Apostles, than to any Guides of the Church ever since. We are sure they spake by an infallible SPIRIT, and where they have determined matters of faith or practice, we look upon it as arrogance and presumption in any others to alter what they have declared. And for the ages since, we have a much greater esteem for those *nearest* the Apostolical times and so downwards, till ignorance, ambition, and private interests, swayed too much among those who were called the Guides of the Church. In matters imposed upon us to believe or practise which are repugnant to plain commands of Scripture, or the evidence of sense, or the grounds of Christian Religion, we assert that no authority of the present Guides of a Church is to overrule our faith

No absolute submission can be due to those Guides of a Church who have opposed and contradicted each other, and condemned one another for error and heresy

In the present divided state of the Christian Church, a man that would satisfy his own mind, must *make use of his judgment in the choice of his Church*, and those guides he is to submit to. Unless a man will say that he is bound to yield himself absolutely to the guidance of that Church which he lives in, whether Eastern or Greek, Roman or Protestant, which, I suppose, *N. O.* [the Bishop's opponent] will never yield to, for a reason he knows, because then no revolter from us could be justified. The true state of the present case, concerning the Guides of the Catholic Church, is this; that it hath been now for many ages rent and torn into several distinct communions; every one of which communions hath particular Guides over it, who pretend it to be the duty of men to live in subjection to them, because every Church doth suppose itself to be in the right. Now the question proposed is, whether it be not fitter for me to submit to the Guides of the Catholic Church, than to trust to my own judgment. *I should make no scruple, in all doubtful matters, to resolve the affirmative, supposing that all the Guides of the Catholic Church were agreed*; for I should think it arrogance and presumption in me to set up my own private opinion in opposition to the unanimous consent of all the Guides of the Catholic Church in such a case; but that is far from *ours*, for we find the Christian world divided into very different communions

And here a man must examine the notes of the Church, and inquire whether they be true notes, whether they agree only to the *Roman Church*? *And one of the greatest of those notes being consent with the Primitive Church*, a man that would be well satisfied, must go through all the disputes between us and the Church of Rome, and by that time he is well settled in them, he will see little use, and less necessity, for an infallible Guide. So that a man who would satisfy himself in this divided state of the Christian Church, what particular communions he ought to embrace, and what Guides he must follow, must do all that for the

preventing of which an infallible Guide is said to be necessary, *i. e.* he must not only exercise his own judgment in particular controversies, but must proceed according to it, and join with that Church which, upon inquiry, he judges to be best.—*Answer to the Book entituled “ Dr. Stillingfleet’s Principles considered,”* Vol. V. p. 55—67.

“ But among Protestants,” he saith, “ Scripture is left to the fanciful interpretation of every private spirit.” If he speaks of *our* Church, *he knows the contrary*, and that we profess to follow the *unanimous consent of the primitive Fathers, as much as they*, [the Romanists,] *and embrace the doctrine of the four General Councils.* But if there have been some among us who *have followed their own fancies in interpreting Scripture*, WE CAN NO MORE HELP THAT THAN THEY CAN DO IN THEIR’S.—*Answer to the remainder of the Reply*, Vol. V. p. 184, 185.

The Church of England is guided by the unanimous consent of the primitive Fathers.

When any persons take upon them to impose any thing upon others as a necessary matter of faith to be believed by them, we can have no better rules of judgment in this case, than those of Vincentius are, *viz. Antiquity, Universality, and Consent*; and whatsoever cannot be proved by these rules, ought to be rejected by all Christians. To make this plain, the ancient Creeds, we allow, on both sides, to have been universally received by the Catholic Church; but now the Church of Rome adds new Articles to be believed, we desire to put the whole matter upon this issue: Let the Pope’s supremacy, the Roman Church’s infallibility, the doctrines of Transubstantiation, Purgatory, &c. be proved by as universal consent of antiquity as the articles of the Creed are, and then let them charge us with heresy if we reject them

St. Vincent’s rule.

Thus far I have taken the pains to search into the opinion of the Primitive Church in this important controversy, which I might carry yet farther, if it were at all needful. The substance of what is delivered by them is this; that if any controversy arise in the Church concerning

The means which are sufficient to discover the sense of Scripture.

the sense of Scripture, if the persons do not allow the Scripture, then we are to proceed by the best means we can have without it, *viz.* the tradition of the Apostolical Churches from the beginning: if they do allow the Scripture, then we are to examine and compare places of Scripture with all the care and judgment that may be. If, after all this, the dispute still continues, then, if it be against the ancient rule of faith¹ universally received, *that is a sufficient prescription against any opinion*; if not against the rule of faith in express words, *but about the sense of it*, then, if ancient *General Councils* have determined it, which had greater opportunities of knowing the sense of the Apostolical Church than we, *it is reasonable we should yield to them*; but if there have been none such, then the *unanimous consent of Fathers is to be taken*, so it be in some late and upstart heresies which men pretend to have by Revelation, or some special grace of God. Now, either all these means were sufficient to find out the sense of Scripture, if not, then the ancient Church was wholly defective, and wanted any certain way of finding out the sense of Scripture; if these were sufficient, then there is no necessity of infallibility, in the Guides of the Church, to give us a certain sense of Scripture.—*Answer to the Book entituled "Dr. Stillingfleet's Principles considered."*—*Works*, Vol. V. p. 91—94.

KENN, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.

B. 1637. D. 1703.

A confession of faith.

As for my Religion, I die in the Holy Catholic and Apostolic faith professed by the whole Church before the disunion of East and West; more particularly I die in the Communion of the Church of England, as it stands distinguished from all Papal and Puritan Innovations, and as it adheres to the doctrine of the Cross.—*His Last Will.*

¹ The rule of faith, *i. e.* "The summary comprehension of a Christian's duty in matters of faith, which was not so often called the *symbol* as the *rule* of faith, that, I mean, which was delivered to persons who were to be baptized and received into the Church."—*Answer to the Book, &c. Works*, Vol. V. p. 91.

I believe, LORD, this Church to be Catholic in respect of all saving faith, of which this Creed contains the substance, which shall in it always be taught.—*Exposition of the Church Catechism.* Edit. 1718. p. 48.

The Catholic Church in-
defectible,
and how far.

KIDDER, BISHOP.

B. 1633. D. 1703.

What I plead for is a judgment of *discretion*, not of *jurisdiction* and *direction*, which belongs to our superiors. 'Tis here as in the laws of a kingdom. The people are obliged to know and keep them. It is the duty and interest of every man to know so much of them as concerns his life and property, and the discharging of his duty to his Prince and country. But then the power of making these laws lies in his Prince or Governors; and the learned in the law are only fit to direct and guide men in matters of doubt and question. And so it is in religion. *It does not belong to every private man to be a preacher and interpreter of holy Writ*, much less hath he any thing to do to make laws for other men. But the private man hath a soul to save, and in order thereunto, is bound to inform himself in matters of faith, and those things which tend to the regulating his life and conversation. (Rom. xiv. 1.) *We do not receive the people as judges of controversies, and doubtful disputations*; yet think them concerned in Religion in the mean time. For matters of dispute and question the Priests' lips are to preserve knowledge. Here it becomes private men to be modest, and to preserve a great reverence for their spiritual Guides. But there is a great deal of difference between asking the way, when we are at a stand, and pulling out our eyes and leaving ourselves wholly to be led by another. We may use our own eyes and our Guides too.—*The Judgment of Private Discretion in matters of Religion defended.* In Bp. Gibson's *Preservative against Popery.* Edit. 1738. Tit. V. c. ii. p. 19.

The judg-
ment of
discretion.

PATRICK, BISHOP.

B. 1626. D. 1707.

Of the
Church's
infallibility.

We cannot allow the Church an infallible authority, that is, such an assistance in her doctrines and proposals, that she cannot err in any thing she defines. In controversies indeed arising about matters of faith, we own and reverence the authority of the Church, (Art. XX.) so as not to contest the public judgment, but to prefer it before our own private conceits, in doubtful things. But as it ought to proceed in its determinations by the rule of God's Word; so we think it possible it may mistake in the application of this rule, and therefore we do not blindly resign ourselves to its authority, without all regard to the holy Scriptures; unto which the Church ought to have a respect in all its determinations If by the Church, indeed, they [the Romanists] would understand the Church truly Catholic, the whole body of CHRIST in all times, places, and ages, and if by *matters of faith* they would understand those grand articles which I have mentioned in the first part of this Discourse [contained in the Apostles' Creed]; and if by being *infallible*, they would understand, not an absolute impossibility of erring, (which human nature is not capable of) but not actual error; there are none of us make any question, but the Church is infallible. That is, the whole Church hath not erred, nor shall err in the whole faith, or in any necessary part thereof; for such error would cut men off from CHRIST, the Head; and so leave Him no Church at all, which is impossible. It hath been the very scope of my first Discourse, to show, that the Church hath always kept the great fundamental truths of our religion, and not erred in them; but transmitted them down to us, whole and undefiled, till the Church of Rome, in the Council of Trent, corrupted the faith, by their errors which they have mixed with it. For to a particular Church, such as that of Rome is, we cannot allow this privilege of not erring; because we know they have erred even in fundamental truths, and thereby

ceased to be Churches. Witness those glorious Churches to which CHRIST Himself sent His Letters by St. John the Apostle.—*The Pillar and Ground of Truth. Gibson's Preservative.* Tit. IV. c. i. p. 114.

We [the Anglican Church] hold and assert, and maintain all those things which have always been, and are confessed by all Christians, *the True, Ancient, Catholic, and Apostolic faith*; and the holy Scriptures, wherein this faith is originally contained. And if we knew any thing else to be the mind of GOD, delivered to us from CHRIST and His Apostles, by the Universal Church, we are prepared to receive it; and, did it appear, would immediately embrace and propagate it. But the *Universal Church* hath declared this to be sufficient, nay, *full and perfect*; and, moreover, forbidden any other faith to be either composed, or offered to those who would become Christians.—*Ibid.* p. 117.

The sufficiency of holy Scripture declared by the Church Catholic.

Whatsoever can be made to appear to come from CHRIST, it hath the highest authority, and ought to be received with absolute submission to it, because He is the SON OF GOD. And, likewise, whatsoever appears to have been delivered by the Apostles in His name, hath the same authority; they being His ministers, sent by Him, as He was by GOD the FATHER, and indued with a Divine Power, which attested unto them. In like manner, whatsoever is delivered by the Church hath the same authority which the Church hath; which though it be not equal to the foregoing (the Church having no such Divine Power, nor infallible judgment, as the Apostles had) yet is of such weight and moment that it ought to be revered next to theirs. I mean, the sense of the whole Church; which must be acknowledged also to be of greater or lesser authority, as it was nearer or farther off from the times of the Apostles. *What* was delivered by their immediate followers, ought to weigh so much with us as to have the greatest human authority, and to be looked upon as little less than divine. The universal consent of the next generation is an authority approaching as near to the former, as the ages do to one another. But what is

The degrees of spiritual authority.

delivered in later times hath less human authority, though pretending to come, but without proof, from more early days; and hath no authority at all, if it contradict the sense of the Church, when it was capable to be better acquainted with the mind of CHRIST, and of His Apostles.

The authority of particular Churches.

As for particular Churches, their authority ought to be revered by every member of them; *when they profess to deliver sincerely the sense of the Church Universal*, and when they determine, as they have power to do, controversies of faith, or decree rites and ceremonies (not contrary to God's word) in which every one ought to acquiesce.

. But to all this it is necessary that it do sufficiently appear, that such doctrines do really come from those Authors, whose traditions they pretend to be. This is the great, and the only thing, about which there is any question among sober and judicious persons: how to be sufficiently assured that any thing which is not delivered unto us in the Scriptures, doth certainly come, for instance, from CHRIST or His holy Apostles. For in this all Christians are agreed, that whatsoever was delivered by CHRIST from GOD the FATHER, or by the Apostles from CHRIST, is to be embraced and firmly retained, *whether it be written or not written*; that makes no difference at all, if we can be certain it came from Him, or them; for what is contained in the holy Scripture, hath not its authority because it is written, but because it came from GOD. If CHRIST said a thing, it is enough, we ought to submit unto it; but we must first know that He said it; and let the means of knowing it be what they will, if we can certainly know He said it, we yield to it.

The word of God to be received whether written or unwritten.

But how we can be certain (at this distance of time from His being in the world) that any thing now pretending to it was said by CHRIST, which is not recorded in the holy Scriptures; there is the business. And it is a matter of such importance, that it cannot be expected any man should be satisfied, without very good evidence, of it; but he may very reasonably question, whether many things be not falsely ascribed unto Him, and unto His Apostles, which never came from them. Nay, whether those things which are

affirmed to be the doctrines of the Primitive Church, and of the whole Church, be not of some later original, and of some particular Church, or private Doctors in the Church, unto whose authority that reverence is not due which ought to be paid, and which we willingly give unto the former.

Now according to this state of the matter, any good Christian among us (who is desirous to know the Truth, and to preserve himself from error) may easily discern what *traditions* ought to be received and held fast, and what we are not bound unto without any alteration, and what are not to be received at all, but to be rejected; and how far those things are from being credible which the Roman Church now would obtrude upon us, under the name of Apostolical, or ancient traditions, without any authority from the holy Scriptures, or (in truth) any authority but their own, and some private Doctors, whose opinions cannot challenge an absolute submission to them. But to give every one, that would be rightly informed, fuller satisfaction in this business, I shall not content myself with this general discourse, but shall particularly and distinctly show what traditions we own, and heartily receive, and then what traditions we cannot own, but with good reason refuse.

And in the first place, we acknowledge that what is now *holy Scripture*, was once only *Tradition*, properly so called, that is, Doctrine by word of mouth. In this we all agree, I say, that the whole Gospel or Doctrine of CHRIST, which is now upon record in those Books we call the *Scriptures*, was once unwritten, when it was first preached by our blessed SAVIOUR and His Apostles; which must be noted, to remove that small objection with which they of the Roman Church are wont to trouble some people's minds, merely from the name of traditions, which St. Paul, in his Epistles, requires those to whom he writes carefully to observe: particularly in that famous place, 1 Thess. ii. 15, where we find this exhortation: "Therefore, Brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions, which ye have been taught, whether by word or our Epistle." Behold, say they, here are things not written, but delivered by word of mouth, which the Thessalonians are commanded to hold. Very true (should

What traditions the Anglican Church receives.
I. The holy Scriptures.

the people of our Church say to those who insist upon this) but behold also, we beseech you, *what* the traditions are of which the Apostle here writes, and mark also *when* it was that they were partly unwritten. For the first of these, it is manifest that he means by traditions, the doctrines which we now read in the holy Scriptures; for the very first word, *therefore*, is an indication that this verse is an inference from what he had said in the foregoing. Now the things he before treated of are the grand doctrines of the Gospel, or the way of salvation revealed unto us by CHRIST JESUS, from GOD the FATHER, who "hath from the beginning (saith he, ver. 13, 14) chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the SPIRIT, and belief of the Truth, whereunto He hath called you," &c. This is the sum of the Gospel, and whatsoever he had delivered to them about these matters, of their *sanctification*, or of their *faith*, or of their *salvation*, by *obtaining the glory of our LORD JESUS CHRIST* (to which they were chosen and called, through their sanctification and faith), this he exhorts them to hold fast, whether it was contained in this Epistle, or in his former preaching; for he had no occasion now to write all that he had formerly delivered by word of mouth, which afterwards was put into writing; for mark (which is the second thing) the time *when* some things remained unwritten, which was, when this Epistle was sent to the Thessalonians. Then some things concerning their salvation were not contained in this letter, but *as yet* delivered only by word of mouth unto *this Church*; I say, to *this Church*, for it doth not follow that all Churches whatsoever were, at the time of the writing of this Epistle, without the doctrine of the Gospel, completely written; because among the Thessalonians some traditions or doctrines were as yet unwritten, which can in reason be extended no farther than to themselves and to this Epistle; which did not contain all the Evangelical Doctrine, though other writings, which it is possible were then extant in other Churches, did. And, I say, *as yet* unwritten in that Church; because the Thessalonians, no doubt, had afterward more communicated to them in writing besides this Epistle, or the former either;

viz. all the Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles, and other Apostolical Epistles, which we now enjoy; which writings, we may be confident, contain the traditions which the Apostle had delivered to the Thessalonians *by word*: concerning the incarnation, birth, life, miracles, death, resurrection, and ascension of our blessed SAVIOUR; and concerning the coming of the HOLY GHOST, and the Mission of the Apostles, and all the rest which is there recorded for our everlasting instruction. And therefore it is in vain to argue from this place, that there are still, at this day, some *unwritten traditions* which we are to follow: unless the Apostle had said, “hold the traditions which ye have been taught by word, which shall never be written.” And it is in vain for us to inquire after any such traditions, or to rely upon them when they are offered unto us; unless we were sure that there was something necessary to our salvation delivered in their Sermons, which was never delivered in writing; and unless we knew where to find it, as certainly as we do that which they have committed to writing

And so much may serve for the first thing; for it would be too long to explain all the rest of the places in holy Scripture, which they are wont to allege (though the word *Tradition* be not mentioned in them) to give a colour to their present pretences: how pertinently may be judged by these places now considered.

II. Secondly then, that word of GOD which was once unwritten, being now written, we acknowledge ourselves to be much indebted to the Church of GOD in all foregoing ages, which hath preserved the Scriptures, and delivered them down to us, as His word; which we ought to do unto those that shall succeed us; as our Church teacheth us in its twentieth article. Where the Church is affirmed to be “a witness and a keeper of holy Writ.”

II. The Tradition of the Scriptures.

This *tradition* we own; it being universal, continued, uninterrupted, and undenied. Though in truth, this is *Tradition* in another sense of the word; *not signifying the doctrine delivered unto us, but the manner and means of its delivery.*

III. Apostolical traditions, which are contained in the ancient Liturgies.

III. And farther, we likewise acknowledge, that the sum and substance of the Christian Religion, contained in the Scriptures, hath been delivered down to us, *even from the Apostles' days*, in *other* ways, or forms, *besides the Scriptures*. For instance, in the Baptismal vow; in the Creed; in the Prayers and Hymns of the Church, which we may call *traditions* if we please: but they bring down to us no new doctrine, but only deliver, in an abridgment, the same Christianity, which we find in the Scriptures. Upon this there is no need that I should enlarge, but I proceed farther to affirm,

IV. The Catholic Tradition which determines the meaning of Scripture.

IV. That we reverently receive all the unanimous Tradition or Doctrine of the Church in all ages, which determines the *meaning* of the holy Scripture; and makes it more clear and unquestionable in any point of faith, wherein we can find it hath declared its sense. For we look upon this tradition as nothing else but the *Scripture unfolded*; not a new thing, *which is not in the Scripture*, but *the Scripture explained and made more evident*. And thus some part of the Nicene Creed may be called a tradition; as it hath expressly declared unto us the sense of the Church of God, concerning that great article of our faith; that JESUS CHRIST is *the SON of GOD*. Which they teach us was always thus understood; the SON of GOD, *begotten of His FATHER before all worlds, and of the same substance with the FATHER*. But this tradition supposeth the Scripture for its ground; and delivers nothing but what the Fathers assembled at Nice, believed to be contained there; and was first fetched from thence. For we find in Theodoret (lib. i. c. 6,) that the famous Emperor Constantine, admonished those Fathers, in all their questions and debates, to consult only with these heavenly inspired writings: *because the Evangelical and Apostolical Books, and the oracles of the old Prophets, do evidently instruct us what to think in Divine matters*. This is so clear a testimony, that in those days, they made this the complete rule of their faith, whereby they ended controversies (which was the reason that in several other Synods we find they were wont to lay the Bible before them) and that there is nothing

in the Nicene Creed, but what is to be found in the Bible, that Cardinal Bellarmine hath nothing to reply to it, but this: "Constantine was indeed a great Emperor, but no great Doctor." Which is rather a scoff, than an answer; and casts a scorn not only upon him, but upon that great Council, who, as the same Theodoret witnesseth, assented unto that speech of Constantine. So it there follows in these words, "the most of the Synod were obedient to what he had discoursed; and embraced both mutual concord, and sound doctrine."

And accordingly St. Hilary, a little after, extols his son Constantius for this, that he adhered to the Scriptures, and blames him only for not attending to the *true Catholic sense of them*. His words are these (in his little Book, which he delivered to Constantius), "I truly admire thee, O Lord Constantius the Emperor, who desirest a faith according to what is written." They pretended to no other in those days; but (as he speaks a little after) looked upon him "that refused this, as Antichrist." It was only required, that they should receive their faith out of God's Books, not merely according to the *words* of them, but according to their *true meaning*, (because many "spake Scripture without Scripture, and pretended to faith without faith," as his words are;) *and herein Catholic and constant Tradition was to guide them*. For *whatsoever was contrary to what the whole Church had received and held from the beginning, could not in reason be thought to be the meaning of Scripture*, which was alleged to prove it. And, on the other side, the Church pretended to no more than to be a *witness* of the received sense of the Scriptures, which were the bottom upon which they built this faith. Thus, I observe, Hegesippus saith (in *Euseb.* his History, lib. IV. c. 22,) that when he was at Rome he met with a great many Bishops, and that he *received the very same Doctrine from them all*. And then, a little after, tells us what that was, and whence they derived it, saying, *that in every succession of Bishops, and in every City, so they held, as the Law preached, and as the Prophets, and as*

the Lord. That is, according to the Doctrine of the Old and New Testament. I shall conclude this particular with a pregnant passage, which I remember in a famous Divine of our Church, (Dr. Jackson, in his Treatise of the Catholic Church, chap. xxii.) who writes to this effect.¹ The like may be said of the rest of the four first General Councils, whose decrees are a great confirmation of our belief, because they deliver to us the consent of the Churches of CHRIST, in those great truths which they assert out of the holy Scriptures. And could there any *traditive* interpretation of the whole Scripture be produced upon the authority of such *Original Tradition*, as that now named, we would most thankfully and joyfully receive it. But there never was any such pretended; no, not by the Roman Church; whose Doctors differ among themselves about the meaning of hundreds of places in the Bible; which they would not do sure, nor spend their time unprofitably in making the best conjectures they are able, if they knew of any expositions of those places in which all Christian Doctors had agreed from the beginning.

V. Traditions confirmatory of Scripture.

V. But, more than this, we allow that Tradition gives us a considerable assistance in such points as are not in so many letters and syllables contained in the Scriptures, but may be gathered from thence by good and manifest reasoning; or, in plainer words, perhaps, whatsoever tradition justifies any doctrine that may be proved by the Scriptures, though not found in express terms there, we acknowledge to be of great use, and readily receive and follow it, as serving very much to establish us more firmly in that Truth, when we see all Christians have adhered to it.

Infant Baptism.

This may be called a *confirming tradition*, of which we have an instance in the doctrine of *Infant Baptism*; which some ancient Fathers call an *Apostolical tradition*. Not that it cannot be proved by any place of Scripture; no such matter: for though we do not find it written in

¹ For this quotation from Dr. Jackson, see ante, pp. 57, 58, 59, from "Howbeit, that Ecclesiastical Tradition," &c., to "in the unity of the same Faith."

so many words, that infants are to be baptized, or that the Apostles baptized infants; yet it may be proved out of the Scriptures, and the Fathers themselves, who call it an Apostolical tradition, do allege testimonies of the Scriptures to make it good. And therefore we may be sure, they comprehended the Scriptures within the name of Apostolical Tradition; and believed that this doctrine was gathered out of the Scriptures, though not expressly treated of there.

In like manner we, in this Church, assert the authority of Bishops above Presbyters, by a Divine Right; as appears by the Book of Consecration of Bishops, where the person to be ordained to this office, expresses his belief, *that he is truly called to this ministration, according to the will of our LORD JESUS CHRIST*. Now this we are persuaded may be plainly enough proved, to any man that is ingenuous and will fairly consider things, out of the Holy Scriptures, without the help of Tradition: but we also take in the assistance of this for the conviction of Gainsayers; and by the perpetual practice and Tradition of the Church from the beginning, confirm our Scripture proofs so strongly, that he seems to us very obstinate, or extremely prejudiced, that yields not to them. And therefore to make our doctrine in this point the more authentic, our Church hath put both these proofs together, in the Preface to the form of giving orders; which begins in these words: “It is evident unto all men diligently reading *holy Scripture and ancient Authors*, that from the Apostles’ time there have been three orders of ministers in CHRIST’S Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.”¹

I hope nobody among us is so weak as to imagine, when he reads this, that by admitting *Tradition* to be of such use and force as I have mentioned, we yield too much to the Popish cause, which supports itself by this pretence. But if any one shall suggest this to any of our people, let him reply; that it is but the pretence, and only by the name of Tradition, that the Romish Church supports itself: for *true Tradition* is as great a proof against *Popery*,

¹ See ante, p. 2.

as it is for *Episcopacy*. The very foundation of the Pope's Empire, (which is, his succession in St. Peter's supremacy,) is utterly subverted by this; the constant Tradition of the Church being evidently against it. And therefore let us not lose this advantage we have against them, by ignorantly refusing to receive a true and constant *Tradition*, which will be so far from leading us into their Church, that it will never suffer us to think of being of it, while it remains so opposite to what is truly Apostolical.

I conclude this with the direction which our Church gives to preachers in the Book of Canons 1571, (in the title *Concionatores*) "That no man," &c.¹ This is our rule whereby we are to guide ourselves, which was set us on purpose, to preserve our preachers from broaching any idle, novel, or popish Doctrines; as appears by the conclusion of that injunction.²

VI. Pious opinions universally believed, and not contrary to Scripture.

VI. But though nothing may be taught as a piece of religion, which hath not the forenamed original; yet I must add, that those things which have been universally believed, and not contrary to Scripture, though not written at all there, nor to be proved from thence, we do receive as pious opinions. For instance, the *perpetual virginity* of the mother of GOD our SAVIOUR; which is so likely a thing, and so universally received, that I do not see why we should not look upon it as a genuine Apostolical tradition.

VII. Traditions of the Church respecting matters of order, rites, &c.

VII. I have but one thing more to add, which is, that we allow also the traditions of the Church, about matters of *order, rites, and ceremonies*. Only we do not take them to be parts of GOD's worship; and if they be not appointed in the holy Scriptures, we believe they may be altered by the same, or the like authority, with that which ordained them. So our Church hath excellently and fully resolved us, concerning such matters, in the thirty-fourth Article of Religion.

¹ See ante, p. 5.

² "Vain and old wives' opinions, and heresies, and Popish errors, abhorring from the doctrine and faith of CHRIST, they shall not teach; nor any thing at all whereby the unskilful multitude may be inflamed, either to the study of novelty, or to contention."

VIII. As for what is delivered in matters of Doctrine, or Order, by any private Doctor in the Church, or by any particular Church, it appears by what hath been said, that it cannot be taken to be more than the private opinion of that man, or the particular decree of that Church, and can have no more authority than they have; that is, cannot oblige all Christians, unless it be contained in the Holy Scripture. Now, such are the traditions which the Roman Church would impose upon us, and impose upon us after a strange fashion. Our people may hereby be admonished not to suffer themselves to be deceived and abused by words and empty names, without their sense and meaning. Nothing is more common than this, especially in the business of traditions, about which a great stir is raised, and it is commonly given out, that we refuse all traditions; than which, nothing is more false, for we refuse none truly so called; that is, the doctrines delivered by CHRIST, or His Apostles. No, we refuse nothing at all, *because it is unwritten*, but merely because we are not sure it is delivered by that authority to which we ought to submit. Whatsoever is delivered to us by our LORD and His Apostles, we receive as the very Word of GOD, *which, we think, is sufficiently declared in the holy Scriptures*. But if any can certainly prove, by any authority *equal to that which brings the Scriptures to us*, that there is any thing else delivered by them, we receive that also. The controversy will soon be at an end, for we are ready to embrace it, when any such thing can be produced.

Nay, we have that reverence for those who succeeded the Apostles, *that what they have unanimously delivered to us, as the sense of any doubtful place, we receive it, and seek no farther*. There is no dispute, whether, or no, we should entertain it. To the decrees of the Church, also, we submit in matters of decency and order, yea, and acquiesce in its authority, when it determines doubtful opinions. But we cannot receive that as a doctrine of CHRIST, which we know is but the tradition of man; nor keep the ordinances of the ancient Church, in matters of decency, so unalterably as never to vary from them, because they themselves did

not intend them to be of everlasting obligation. As appears by the changes that have been made in several times and places, even in some things which are mentioned in the holy Scriptures, being but customs suited to those ages and countries.

In short, *traditions we do receive*, but not all that are called by that name: those which have sufficient authority, but not those which are imposed upon us by the *sole* authority of one *particular* Church, assuming a power over the rest. And so I come to the second part.

We reject traditions which contain "doctrines necessary to salvation," which are not revealed in holy Scripture.

I. And, in the first place, we do not believe that there is any tradition which contains *another Word of God which is not in the Scripture, or cannot be proved from thence*. In this consists the main difference between us and them of the Romish persuasion, who affirm that Divine Truth which we are all bound to receive, to be *partly written*, partly delivered by word of mouth, *without writing*; which is not only the affirmation of the Council of Trent,¹ but delivered

¹ See the Introduction. Note. When understood as explained by Bellarmine and the majority of the Roman Divines, the Council of Trent may declare the insufficiency of Scripture, but there is nothing in the bare *letter* of the decree to warrant the opinion. "That decree only receives traditions which have descended by '*continual succession*' in the '*Catholic Church*,' and it does not affirm that any such traditions are not *also* conveyed in Scripture. They may be essentially identical with Scripture itself; and accordingly the learned and candid Cassander described the Scripture as Tradition folded up and sealed, and Tradition, as Scripture explained and opened. The one is in fact the other in a different form. And, however little we might imagine it, the very same notion of Tradition has been held or admitted by Romanists of eminence; for instance, White, in his *Apology for Tradition*, observes, that 'it is not the Catholic position that *all its doctrines are not contained in Scripture*;' and Bailly, a theologian of much authority in the Romish Schools even at present, admits that '*ne minimum quidem tradi debet sine Scripturis quarum interpretatio ad Ecclesiam pertinet . . . verum est quidem totam fidem Christianam ex Scripturarum divinarum demonstratione vim habere, seu Scripturas esse fundamentum fidei nostræ, sive quia fidei dogmata Scripturis probantur, sive quia ipsa autoritas Ecclesiæ traditionumque necessitas ac veritas Scripturis fundantur*. Hinc S. Doctor (Cyrillus Hierosol.) scribit nullam veritatem esse accipiendam nisi ex Scripturis demonstratur; sed ibi sermo est de Scripturis, ad sensum Ecclesiæ quæ fidus est sacrorum codicum interpres, intellectis.' The subjection to the sufficiency of Scripture, as a rule of faith, is, in short, only an objection to such a view, as would exclude tradition as confirmatory of its true meaning. It would be easy to adduce other cases in

in more express terms in the Preface to the Roman Catechism, drawn up by their order, where we find these words (towards the conclusion of it), “The *whole Doctrine* to be delivered to the Faithful, is contained in the Word of GOD, which (Word of GOD) *is distributed into Scripture and Tradition.*”

II. We dare not receive any thing whatsoever merely upon the credit of the Roman Church, no, not that Divine, that holy Tradition before spoken of, viz. the Scripture; which we do not believe only upon their testimony, both because they are but a part of the Church, and, therefore, not the sole keepers of Divine Truth; and they are a corrupted part, who have not approved themselves faithful in the keeping what was committed to them.

We receive nothing merely upon the credit of the Church of Rome.

Let our people diligently mark this, that traditions never were, nor are now, only in the keeping of the Roman Church; and that these things are widely different, the Tradition of the whole Church, or of the greatest and best part of it: and the Tradition of one part of the Church, and the least part of it; and the worst part, also, and most depraved. What is warranted by the authority of the whole Church, I have shown before, we reverently receive; but we cannot take that for current Tradition, which is warranted only by that part of it which is Roman.

III. And the next is a consequence from what hath been now said: that there being so little credit to be given to the Roman Church only, we cannot receive those doctrines for Truth, which that Church now presses upon our belief, upon the account of *Tradition*. For instance, that the Church of Rome is the mother and mistress of all other Churches; that the Pope of Rome is the Monarch or Head of the Universal visible Church; that all Scriptures must be expounded according to the sense of this Church; that there are truly and properly seven Sacraments, neither more nor less, instituted by our blessed LORD Himself in the New

We cannot receive those doctrines which the Church of Rome now presses upon us upon account of traditions.

which Romish theologians do not insist on the existence of any other Tradition; and, were this the only view maintained generally in that communion, we should have no difficulties on the subject.”—See an able Article in the *British Critic*, No. XL. (pp. 426—446) on the *Roman Schism*.

Testament; that there is a proper and propitiatory Sacrifice offered in the Mass for the quick and dead, the same that CHRIST offered on the cross; in short, the half communion, and all the rest of the articles of their new faith, in the Creed published by Pope Pius IV. Which are traditions of the *Roman* Church alone, not of the *Universal*; and rely solely upon their own authority. And therefore we refuse them, and in our disputes about traditions, we mean these things; which we reject because they have no foundation, either in the holy Scripture, or in Universal Tradition; but depend, as I said, upon the sole authority of that Church, which witnesses in its own behalf. For whatsoever is pretended, to make the better show, all resolves itself at last into that; as I intimated in the beginning of this Discourse. *Scripture* and *Tradition* can do nothing at all for them, without their Church's *definition*. Though their whole infallible rule of faith seem to be made up of those *three*, yet in truth, the last of these alone, the *Church's definition*, is the whole rule; and the very bottom upon which their faith stands. For what is Tradition, is no more apparent, than, what is Scripture, according to their principles, without the authority of their Church; which pretends to an unlimited power to supply the defect even of Tradition itself. In short, as Tradition among them is taken in to *supply the defect of Scripture*; so the authority of their Church is taken in to supply the defect of Tradition; but this authority undermines them both; because neither Scripture nor Tradition signify any thing, without their Church's authority. Which therefore is the rule of their faith; that is, they believe themselves.

No particular Church has authority to commend any thing as an Article of faith to posterity which it hath not received, as such, from the Apostles.

IV. And what hath been said of them, must be applied to other particular Churches; though some have been more sincere than they. None of them hath any authority to commend any thing as an Article of faith unto posterity, which hath not been commended to them by all foregoing ages, derived from the Apostles. For Vincentius his rule is to guide us all in this, "that is Catholic (and consequently to be received) which hath been held by all, and in all Churches, and at all times."

V. Which puts me in mind of another thing, to be briefly touched; that the Ecclesiastical Tradition contained in the confessions or registers of particular Churches in these days wherein we live, is not received by us, nor allowed to have the same authority which such Tradition had at the time of the Nicene Council, for the conviction of heresy. The joint consent, I mean, of so many Bishops as were there assembled, and the unanimous concessions of so many several Churches of several Provinces as were there delivered, hath not now such a force to induce belief, as it had then. The reason of which is given by the same Vincentius, who so highly commends that way which was then taken of reproofing Heresy: but adds the most wise caution (in the last chapter but one of the first part of his *Commonitorium*) “but you must not think that all heresies, and always, are thus to be opposed; but only new and fresh Heresies: when they first rise up, that is, before they have falsified the rules of the ancient faith, &c. As for inveterate heresies which have spread themselves, they are in no wise to be assaulted this way; because in a long tract of time, many opportunities may have presented themselves to heretics, of stealing Truth out of ancient records, and of corrupting the volumes of our ancestors.”

Of the Ecclesiastical Tradition contained in the confessions of particular Churches in these days.

How then, may some say, can heresies of long standing be confuted? The same Vincentius resolves us in this, in the very next words, “We may convince them, if need be, by the sole authority of the Scriptures; or eschew them as already convicted and condemned in ancient times, by the General Councils of Catholic Priests.”

The Tradition which is found there must direct all future Councils, not the opinions of their own present Churches.

VI. I will add but one thing more; which is, that the Tradition called *Oral*, because it comes by word of mouth from one age to another, without any written record, is the most uncertain, and can be least relied upon of all other. This hath been demonstrated so fully by the writers of our Church, and there are such pregnant instances of the errors into which men have been led by it, that it needs no long Discourse. Thus I have endeavoured to lay

Oral Tradition most uncertain.

before the eyes of those, who will be pleased to look over this short Treatise, what they are to think and speak about Tradition. It is a calumny to affirm that the Church of England rejects all Tradition; and I hope, none of her true children are so ignorant, as when they hear that word, to imagine they must rise up and oppose it. No, the Scripture itself is a Tradition; *and we admit all other Traditions which are subordinate, and agreeable unto that; together with all those things that can be proved to be Apostolical, by the general testimony of the Church in all ages: nay, if any thing NOT CONTAINED IN SCRIPTURE, which the Roman Church now pretends to be a part of GOD'S Word, were delivered to us, by as universal uncontrolled Tradition as the Scripture is, WE SHOULD RECEIVE IT AS WE DO THE SCRIPTURE.*—*A Discourse about Tradition. Gibson's Pre-servative. Tit. IV. c. iii. pp. 191—204.*

SHERLOCK, PRIEST.

B. 1641. D. 1707.

The faith
of the An-
glican
Church is
founded on
Scripture
and Aposto-
lical Tradi-
tion.

The Church of England has regard to the Doctrine of the Primitive Church in expounding Scripture, not that she fetches all her expositions from ancient writers, but that she takes care not to expound Scripture in contradiction to the ancient faith of the Church contained in the ancient Creeds; and it requires no great skill in antiquity to know what this faith is which we repeat every day in the Apostles' Creed; and this is a good argument that we expound Scripture right, when the sense we give it is what the words and reason of the text import, and agrees with the faith of the first and purest ages of the Church. Had we no ancient Records, we could find out the true sense of Scripture in all necessary points of faith; but the Traditionary Doctrine of the Church, where the tradition is plain and clear, and therefore easily known, is a great confirmation of those interpretations we give of Scripture in conformity to the ancient belief, and confutes all the evasions and criticisms of heretics. For when the words of Scripture may with

some art be expounded to different senses, either to justify some new or ancient heresies, or the Catholic faith, *we need not doubt but that is the true sense, which agrees with the uniform belief of the Primitive Church, who were the best judges what the faith of the Apostles was, by whom the Scriptures were written;* and though there were indeed very ancient heresies, yet nothing is plainer in Ecclesiastical History than the distinction between those ancient heresies and the Catholic faith, and therefore scholars cannot easily mistake them; and as for those who are unlearned, that short and ancient summary of the Catholic faith, contained in the Apostles' Creed, and expounded by the Nicene Fathers in their Creed, which is in everybody's hands, and part of our daily or weekly service, is security enough against all fundamental mistakes.

The Christians of the Church of England have a very plain and easy resolution of their faith. As for positive articles of faith we have the ancient Creeds, which have been received in all ages of the Christian Church from the times of the Apostles, and which the most perverse heretics cannot deny to have been the Catholic faith, and yet we do not believe these *merely* upon the authority of Tradition, but because we find all these doctrines plainly taught in Scripture. . . . Now what greater assurance can we have in this case, than the harmony and consent of Scripture and Tradition, which confirm and justify each other? The Apostles, no doubt, preached and writ the same things, and it is a good argument, that is an incorrupt tradition which agrees with the doctrine of the Scripture, and that that is a true exposition of Scripture which agrees with the ancient Formularies of faith, delivered down to us by an unquestionable Tradition from the first ages of the Church. . . . Though heretics pretend to expound Scripture, yet they contradict the faith of the Primitive Church, and therefore their case differs vastly from the case of the Church of England, *whose faith is founded both on Scripture and Apostolic Tradition.*—*A Discourse concerning a Judge of Controversies.* Gibson's *Preservative*. Tit. IV. c. i. pp. 45—47.

The uni-
versal con-
sent of the
Catholic
Church is
the best
external
testimony
of the Chris-
tian faith.

They [the Romanists] must grant, that the universal consent of the Church in all ages, not excluding the Church of Rome itself, as a part of the Catholic Church, is the best external testimony of the Christian faith. Now when we believe the same things which the Church of Rome does, upon the authority of CHRIST and His Apostles, whose Doctrine is contained in the writings of the New Testament, *and expounded by the general faith of the Christian Church in all ages*, what appearance of uncertainty can be charged on such a faith? we reject, indeed, the infallible authority of the *present* Church of Rome; but what then? will not a true orthodox faith save us, unless we believe in CHRIST upon the authority of a *particular* Church, which had no being when Christianity was first planted in the world?—*A Discourse concerning a Judge of Controversies. Gibson's Preservative. Tit. IV. c. i. p. 71.*

The use
which the
Church of
England
makes of
the Church
Catholic in
the inter-
pretation of
holy Scrip-
ture.

This use the Church of England makes of the Catholic Church, in expounding Scripture, that she religiously maintains the ancient Catholic faith, and will not suffer any man to expound Scriptures in opposition to the ancient faith and practice of the Catholic Church. But though the belief and practice of the Catholic Church be the best means of understanding the true sense of Scripture, yet we cannot affirm this of any particular Church, or of the Church of any particular age, excepting the Apostolic age, or those ages which immediately succeeded the Apostles. Notwithstanding this, the Church of Rome may be no good expositor of Scriptures; for the Church of Rome, though she usurp the name of the Catholic Church, as presuming herself to be the head and fountain of Catholic unity, yet she is but a part of the Catholic Church, as the Church of England, and the Churches of France and Holland are; and has no more right to impose her expositions of Scripture upon other Churches, than they have to impose upon her. If there happen any controversy between them, it is not the authority of either Church can decide it, but this must be done by an appeal to Scripture,

and the sense of the Catholic Church, in the first and purest ages of it. For when we say, that the belief and practice of the Catholic Church, is the best means to find out the true sense of Scripture, we do not mean that the Church is the sovereign and absolute judge of the sense of Scripture; but the meaning is, that those Churches, which were founded by the Apostles, and received the faith immediately from them, and were afterwards, for some ages, governed by Apostolical men, or those who were taught by them, and conversed with them, are the *best witnesses what the doctrine of the Apostles was*; and therefore, as far as we can be certain what the faith of these Primitive Churches was, *they are the best Guides for the expounding Scripture.* So that the authority of the Church in expounding Scripture, being only the authority of witnesses, it can reach no farther than those ages which may reasonably be presumed to be authentic and credible witnesses of the doctrine of the Apostles; and therefore, if we extend it to the four first General Councils, it is as far as we can do it with any pretence of reason, and thus far the Church of England owns the authority of the Church, and commands her ministers to expound the Scriptures according to the Catholic faith, owned and professed in those days; but as for the latter ages of the Church, which were removed too far from the Apostles' days, to be witnesses of their doctrine, they have no more authority in this matter, than we have at this day, nor has one Church any more authority than another. And therefore, if by the Church being the means of knowing the sense and meaning of the holy Scriptures, be understood judgment and sentence, and decree of the Church, that we must seek no farther for the reason of our faith than the infallible authority of the Church, in expounding Scripture; this also is absolutely false and absurd.

This is more than CHRIST and His Apostles assumed to themselves, while they were on earth; they were indeed infallible interpreters of Scripture, yet they never bore down their hearers merely with their authority, but expounded the Scriptures, and applied ancient prophecies to their events, and took the veil off Moses's face, and showed

them the Gospel-State concealed under those types and figures; they confirmed their expositions of Scripture by the force of reason, and appealed to the judgments and consciences of their hearers whether these things were not so. . . . Now I think no Church can pretend to be more infallible than CHRIST and His Apostles, and therefore, certainly ought not to assume more to themselves than they did; and if the Church of Rome, or any other Church, will convince us of the truth of their expositions of Scripture, as CHRIST and His Apostles convinced their hearers, that is, by enlightening our understandings, and convincing our judgments by proper arguments, we will gladly learn of them.

This course the Primitive Church took, as is evident in all the writings of the ancient Fathers against Jews and heretics; they argue from the Scriptures themselves to prove what the sense of Scripture is. They appeal indeed sometimes to the sense of the Catholic Church, not as an infallible judge of Scripture, *but as the best witnesses of the Apostolical Doctrine*. Thus Tertullian argues against heretics, in his book *De Præscriptionibus*; but when they reason about the sense of Scripture, they never direct us to any infallible judge, but use such arguments as they think proper to convince gainsayers.

The Fathers in the ancient Councils, reasoned from Scripture and the sense of the Catholic Church.

Nay, this is the way which was observed in all the ancient Councils: the Bishops of the Church met together for common council and advice, and in matters of discipline and government, which were subject to their authority, they considered what was most for the public benefit of the Church, and determined them by their authority, not as infallible Judges, but as the supreme Governors of the Church. In the disputes of faith they reason from Scripture *and the sense of the Catholic Church*, not from their own authority; and what, upon a serious debate and inquiry, they found to be most agreeable to the sense of Scripture and the doctrine of the Church in former ages, that they determined and decreed to be received in all Churches as the Catholic faith. That this is so, is evident from all the histories of the most ancient and celebrated Councils, which any man may consult who pleases. Now I

would ask some few questions about this matter: 1. Whether these Councils took a sure and safe way to find out truth? if they did not, what reason have we to believe that they determined right? if they did, then we may use the same way which they did; for that which is a good way in one age is so in another; and then there is no necessity of an infallible judge to find out the sense of Scripture, because we have other certain ways of doing this; the same which all the ancient Councils observed. 2. I would know, whether it be not sufficient for every Christian to receive the decrees and determinations of these Councils, upon the same reason and authority which moved the Fathers assembled in Council to make these decrees? whether, for instance, we must not believe the eternal Godhead of CHRIST, and that He is of the same substance with His FATHER, for the same reasons for which the Nicene Fathers believed this, and required all Christians to believe it? If we must, then Scripture and the sense of the Catholic Church, not the authority of a General Council, or any infallible *judge*, is the reason of our faith. For the Nicene Fathers, who were the first that met in a General Council, could not believe this upon the authority of any other General Council, much less upon their own authority, unless we will say, that they first decreed this, then believed it, because they themselves decreed it. If Scripture and the sense of the Catholic Church, antecedently to the determinations of a General Council, or any other pretended infallible judge, be not a sufficient foundation for our faith, then the whole Christian world before the Council of Nice, which was the first General Council, had no sufficient foundation for their faith; for there was no particular Bishop or Church in those days, which pretended to be an infallible interpreter of the Scriptures. We Protestants have the same way to understand the Scriptures, have the same reason and foundation of our faith, which the Nicene Fathers themselves had, or which any Christian could have, before there was any General Council, and if the Church of Rome do not think this enough, we cannot help that, we are abundantly satisfied with it. The authority of a General Council in those

days was deservedly sacred and venerable, not as an infallible judge, which they never pretended to, but *as the most certain means they could possibly have* to understand what was, and in all ages had been the received doctrine of the Catholic Church. They met together, not to make new articles of faith, which no Council in the world ever had authority to do, but to *declare what was the truly ancient and Apostolic faith*, and to put it into such words as might plainly express the Catholic sense, and meet with the distempers of that age. For this end, grave and reverend Bishops assembled from all parts of the Christian world, not merely to give their private opinions of things, but to declare what was the received Doctrine of those Churches over which they presided; and I know no better argument of an Apostolic tradition, than the consent of all Churches, as remote from each other as east and west, which were planted by several Apostles, and differed very much from each other in some external rites and usages, but yet all agreed in the same faith. And this is the true authority of those ancient Councils, that they were most likely to understand the true sense of Scripture and of the Catholic Church. This is the Protestant resolution of faith, and the Nicene Fathers themselves had no other way, nor pretended to any other.—*The Protestant Resolution of Faith. Gibson's Preservative.* Tit. V. c. i. pp. 9—11.

BEVERIDGE, BISHOP AND DOCTOR.

B. 1637. D. 1707.

The sufficiency of holy Scripture.

The holy Scripture, thus written in Hebrew and Greek, containeth nothing but the will of God, and the whole will of God; so that there is nothing necessary to be believed, &c. concerning God, nor done in obedience to God by us, but what is here revealed to us; and therefore all traditions of men not recorded in this Word of God, are not necessarily to be believed. What is here written we are bound to believe, because it is written; and what is not here written we are not bound to believe it, because it is not

written. I say we are not bound to believe it, but I cannot say we are bound not to believe it; for there be many things which we may believe, nay, are bound to believe, because truth, which notwithstanding are not recorded in the Word of God. But though there be many things we may believe, yet there is nothing we need believe in order to our everlasting happiness, which is not here written; so that if we believe all that is here spoken, and do all that is here commanded, we shall certainly be saved, though we do not believe what is not here spoken, nor do what is not here commanded.—*On the VIth Article. Works. Edit. 1824. Vol. IX. pp. 205, 206.*

Hence, therefore, we may observe how that although the Scriptures contain none but sound and wholesome words, such as Timothy heard of St. Paul, yet such is the weakness of men's understandings, such the perverseness of their wills, the disorder of their affections, and the pravity of their whole souls, that they extract poison from that which was intended for their food, draw error out of truth, heresy out of the Scriptures themselves, so as to learn to blaspheme God in His own words. But what then shall we do in this case? how can we be ever certain that the *words* we use in matters of religion be *sound*, and by consequence our opinions orthodox, and our sentiments of God, and those eternal truths which He hath revealed to us, such as He Himself would have them? Why, surely for this end it is necessary that we indulge not our own fancies, nor idolize our own private opinions, but *hold fast the form of sound words* delivered to us in the holy Scriptures, *in that sense which the Catholic Church in all ages hath always put upon them.*

The Catholic
Church an
infallible
Interpreter
of Scripture.

For the eternal SON of GOD having with His own blood purchased to Himself an universal Church, we cannot doubt but that He takes sure care of it, that, according to His promise, *the gates of hell shall never prevail against it.* For which end, He, the Head of this mystical body, doth not only defend and protect it by His Almighty power, but He so acts, guides, directs, and governs it by His HOLY SPIRIT,

that though errors and heresies may sometimes disease and trouble some parts of it, yet they can never infect the whole; but that is still kept sound and entire, notwithstanding all the power and malice of men or devils against it. So that if we consider the Universal Church, or congregation of faithful people, as in all ages dispersed over the whole world, we may easily conclude that the greatest part, from which the whole must be denominated, *was always in the right*; which the ancient Fathers were so easily persuaded of, that although the word *καθολικὸς* properly signifies universal, yet they commonly used it in the same sense as we do the word orthodox, as opposed to an heretic, calling an orthodox man a Catholic, that is, a son of the Catholic Church; as taking it for granted that they, and only they, which constantly adhere to the doctrine of the *Catholic* or Universal Church, are truly orthodox; which they could not do, unless they had believed the Catholic Church to be so. And besides that, it is part of the Creed, that the Catholic Church is *holy*, which she could not be except free from heresy, as directly opposite to true holiness.

He, therefore, that would be sure not to fall into damnable errors, must be sure to continue firm and steadfast to the doctrine of the Universal Church, *as being grounded upon the Scriptures rightly understood*; FOR SO EVERY THING IS THAT SHE HATH TAUGHT US. For the Catholic Church never undertook, as the *Romish* hath done, to coin any new doctrines of her own head; no, she always took the Scripture for *her only standard of truth*, and hath accordingly delivered her sense of them, in such words as she judged exactly to agree with those which are there used.—*Sermon on 2 Tim. i. 13. Sermons. Vol. I. pp. 56, 57. Lond. Fol. 1729.*

The
temerity of
the present
age in mat-
ters of reli-
gion.

To such a degree of temerity has this our senseless age advanced, that there is scarcely any thing in Christianity itself which is not either called into doubt in private, or made matter of controversy in public. So much so, that even those doctrines and rites which, during many ages back, and from the very beginnings of the Church, have

every where been received, at last in these our days come into hazard, and are assailed, just as if we were the first Christians, and all our ancestors had assumed and borne the mere name of CHRIST, and nothing more; or at least, as if all had been constantly involved in the gravest errors, whoever before this time embraced the faith made known in the Gospel. Forsooth in these full late times, it seems new lights are boasted of, new and greater gifts of the HOLY SPIRIT are pretended, and therefore new forms of believing, new forms of praying, new forms of preaching, new forms in the use of ecclesiastical administrations, are daily framed and commonly adopted. And, what is most absurd, nothing now is esteemed of before novelty itself, but the newer any thing is, so much the greater number and the more does it please, and the more anxiously is it defended. Hence these tears, hence so many horrible schisms in the Church! For whilst individuals, indulging, beyond what is meet, their abilities, or rather their own wanton fancies, devote themselves to the introduction of novelties into religion, the whole body, through the infinite diversity of opinions, comes to be rent into contrary schools and factions.

II. But if we will only even now recollect ourselves, and weigh things with that temperate and fair spirit which is right, it will at once be clear that we, who now inhabit this and other countries around, are not either the first or the only worshippers of CHRIST, but only a small part of that great body whose head is CHRIST: inasmuch as that body, by the exceeding mercy of GOD, hath been spread abroad into all parts of the earth, and that, from the very times of the Apostles; so that there is no age, and scarcely any country, in which there have not been very many who, by the faith which we profess, have attained unto heaven. According to this view, if we attentively survey this vast body of all Christians of every age, which is commonly called the *Catholic* or *Universal Church*, as constituted every where and always, we shall find in it certain, fixed, and, as it were, common principles, which run through the whole, and connect all its parts both with each other and

The inspira-
tion of holy
Scripture.

Divers
interpreta-
tions of holy
Scripture.

The consent
of the Catho-
lic Church to
be followed.

with the head. The first of these, and that from which the rest arise, is, *that holy Scripture, or the Old and New Testament, is divinely inspired*. In this all Christians every where agree, and have always agreed; and therefore he who denies it, is pronounced unworthy of their fellowship and of their name. Still further, this holy Scripture, although in these precepts, which are absolutely necessary for every man's salvation, it be most clear and evident to all, yet, as to what respects doctrine and external discipline of the Church, it is not, from its very depth, received by all in one and the same sense, but, "the divine sayings of this same Scripture are by one man interpreted in one way, and by another in another; so that it would seem to admit almost as many meanings as there are men," as formerly Vincent of Lirins observed, and as is more than sufficiently proved from the case of heretics and schismatics, inasmuch as, among them, every individual elicits his own erroneous opinions and practices out of the holy Scriptures interpreted after his own manner. In things therefore of this nature, if we would be secured from error and falling, first of all, beyond all doubt, we must beware that we do not over pertinaciously adhere to the private opinions and conjectures of ourselves and others, but do rather carefully examine what the ancient Church, or, at least, the great majority of Christians, have held in these matters, and must acquiesce in that decision which has obtained the consent of Christians in all ages. For as, according to Cicero, on every subject, "the consent of all men is the voice of nature," so also in things of this sort, the consent of all Christians may be deservedly accounted the voice of the Gospel. But there are many things which, although they are not read in express and definite terms in the holy Scriptures, are yet by the common consent of all Christians drawn out of these Scriptures. For example; "*that there are in the ever-blessed TRINITY three distinct Persons to be worshipped, the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY GHOST, and that these are, each of them, truly GOD, and yet that there is but one GOD: that CHRIST is GOD and man, θεάνθρωπος,*

truly GOD and truly man, in one and the same person."

These and such like, although they are not, either in the Old or New Testament, declared in so many words and syllables, yet have they, as founded on both, ever been agreed on by all Christians, certain few heretics only excepted, of whom no more account is to be had in religion, than of monsters in nature. So also, "*that infants are to receive the ablution of holy Baptism, and that sponsors are to be used for that Sacrament. That the LORD'S day, or the first day in every seven, is to be religiously observed as a festival. That our LORD'S passion, resurrection, and ascension into heaven, as also the coming of the HOLY GHOST, are to be commemorated every year. That the Church is every where to be administered by Bishops, distinguished from Presbyters, and set over them.*"

These and others of this sort are no where in the sacred Scriptures enjoined directly and by name, yet have they notwithstanding, during fourteen hundred years from the Apostles, been every where received into public use of the Church; nor can there be found any Church during that period not agreeing to these things. So that there have been, as it were, certain *common notions* from the beginning implanted in the minds of all Christians, not so much from any particular passages of holy Scripture, as from all; from the general scope and tenor of the whole Gospel; from the very nature and purpose of the religion therein established; and, finally, *from the constant Tradition of the Apostles*, who, together with the faith, propagated ecclesiastical rites of this sort, and, if I may so speak, general interpretations of the Gospel. For on any other supposition it would be incredible, or even impossible, that they should have been received with so unanimous a consent every where, always, and by all.

III. From these premises, it is clear at the first glance what will follow. For seeing that no one doubts but that more confidence is to be placed in the whole body than in individual christians, and more in the Universal Church than in any particular Churches whatsoever: seeing also that there are very many points in which the Universal

The consent
of the Uni-
versal
Church the
surest inter-
pretation of
Scripture.
The conse-
quent neces-
sity of con-
sulting the
Fathers.

Church, during many ages after the Apostles, agreed: seeing, finally, that this consent of the Universal Church is the surest interpretation of holy Scripture on those points on which it may be had: it hence most clearly follows, of what and how great use the ancient Fathers, and other writers of all ages of the Church, must be, and how necessary to be consulted by them, who, in the prosecution of ecclesiastical controversies, have at heart either their own salvation, or the peace of the Church. For, were there no commentaries of the ancient Church, no acts of Councils, no monuments of ecclesiastical history, extant at this day, in how great darkness should we be involved respecting our very religion itself? How easy would it be for any subtle heretic, or even for any the most flagitious impostor, under the mask of piety, to deceive the generality, and to lead them into the most pernicious errors of every description? Who could then convict the Church of Rome, or any other even the most corrupt communion, of fault or error, in those particulars which are not expressly prohibited in holy Scripture? For whence could it be proved, whether those things which are in use in that Church had, or had not, been handed down from the very Apostles, and approved by the consent of the Universal Church? Finally, how many and how great disadvantages of every kind would arise hence? But there is no reason that we should occupy our time in the enumeration of these things, seeing that amidst so many and so great confusions of empires, convulsions of particular Churches, and perturbation of all human affairs, it hath been so ordered by the most wise and merciful providence of Almighty God, that from the very times of the Apostles even unto these our own times, there is no age whose ecclesiastical memorials are not preserved to us. From which memorials accordingly we are enabled to conceive a perfect idea of the Universal Church, and to feel assured and certain, what has through all ages been admitted and what rejected; what rites and doctrines have prevailed, what heresies and schisms have been disapproved and condemned. Finally, from these

and these alone we may see, on what points of doctrine and discipline agreement hath ever prevailed among all Churches, and on what again controversy hath existed between them, and consequently what is more, and what less, necessary to be believed and observed. For whatever is to be said of other things, those things at any rate in which all Churches every where have agreed, cannot but be most certain, and necessary, even at this very time, to be retained of all.

IV. This consent however, be it remembered, of which we are speaking, of the Universal Church, on any articles of faith or ecclesiastical rites, is not to be sought from one or two writers, much less from any one or two passages in any particular writer, apart from the rest, *but from all combined*, or at least from the greatest part of those, who, in all ages of the Church, (and especially the earlier) were the authors of any written works, in which they treated on these subjects. For in all societies, such as is the Church, the majority takes place of the minority, and has the same right as the whole. The words of the Civil Law are, "What is done by the majority of the court, is accounted the same as if done by all." Nay, this is one of the ordinary rules of that Law. "That is ascribed to the whole, which is publicly done by the majority." That therefore which is by the majority either appointed or affirmed, that is rightly to be considered the act of the Universal Church; much more that which is confirmed by the united testimonies of all, or nearly all. To which class very many things in ecclesiastical matters may easily be reduced. For although we have not the express opinions of every individual Christian, through all ages, handed down to us, yet we possess what is to the same effect. For, first, when we speak of the consent of the Universal Church, it is not necessary that we regard the opinions of the people also, or laity. For they have never been admitted to deliver their judgment on the doctrine or discipline of the Church, in that it was presumed that in all things they, as is right, followed, not led, the opinions of their pastors. And besides, seeing that the people were anciently wont to vote

This consent of the Fathers must be universal.

The Laity have never been permitted to judge in controversies.

in the election of their own bishops, and to give their testimony concerning those to be elected; by that very act they showed openly enough that they agreed to their doctrine and discipline; so that whatever might be the opinion of any one bishop, the people over whom he presided might fairly be held to be guided by the same. In consequence, that this consent of the Church is to be sought not from the people, but from their Bishops, from the teachers and priests, Vincent of Lirins formerly rightly observed: "Consent also in like manner we shall arrive at," says he, "if in this very antiquity we follow the definitions and expressed opinions of all, or, at any rate, of nearly all, the priests and teachers." And indeed this position, namely, "that the consent of the Universal Church is to be sought not from the people, but from the Bishops and clergy," is one of those very many points in which we have the Universal Church itself agreeing; seeing that when about to discuss ecclesiastical matters, she hath rarely suffered the people to be present, never to deliver an opinion, or to vote. For neither, in all the Councils which have ever been held on matters of that sort, do we read, that any one from among the people set his name to the decrees. But in each age the common affairs of the Church were transacted by Bishops alone in Council assembled, with, occasionally, certain presbyters, holding the places of their respective Bishops. Which Councils, if held in any one province, represented that *provincial* Church alone; but if attended by all conjointly, or by the majority of them, they then represented the *Universal Church*. "By which" (Councils), as Tertullian says, "both such points as are of a deeper character are discussed in common, and the very assembly, as representing the whole Christian name, is held in great reverence." But Councils of this sort, as well *provincial*, held by particular provinces, as *Universal*, held (as the origin of their name declares) by the Universal Church, such Councils are even now extant, with many of their acts and decrees. There are extant also very many commentaries of individual Bishops and presbyters, not indeed of all, but yet of those who, in each age, were most

Councils.

learned, and best acquainted with the doctrines and rites of the Church. From all of which, we are able most clearly to see (if any other thing) the common opinions both of all, and each of, the Churches, and so to collect most assuredly what we are to hold on these points. For although we grant it to be doubtful whether others, who either were not authors, or whose writings are not now in existence, may not perchance have held otherwise, yet since that is not capable of proof, and not to be capable of proof, in causes of this sort, is manifestly the same as not to exist; whatever all, or the majority of those, whose genuine works have been left us, taught, as it were in common, that is without any doubt, to be held for the common and constant doctrine of the Universal Church. Especially when the Universal Church also has itself fully enough testified her agreement to that doctrine, which is preserved in the ancient writings of Councils and Fathers, from this fact, that, the providence of God so ordering, she hath preserved to us those writings in which that doctrine is contained, the commentaries, in the mean time, of others, who held otherwise, having been buried in so deep oblivion, that scarcely have their names been transmitted to posterity. From all which things, as briefly and summarily premised, we may rightly conclude, that all, both separate works of individual fathers, and acts and monuments of Synods, as well provincial as universal, which exist at this day, are, in the first place, of this very great and remarkable use to us, in that from them we may consider as certainly proved, what the Universal Church hath ever believed and openly taught, on necessary articles of faith and rites ecclesiastical, and therefore what is to be ever believed and taught in the Church. For no one can doubt but that it is both most safe, and supremely necessary, in all things, as far as is possible, religiously to walk in the steps of the faith and customs of the Universal Church.

V. But perhaps some one may say, "that the Fathers, both separately as individuals, and many of them conjointly, erred in various points of religion; and that they at times disagree among themselves, and that indeed, sometimes, on

An objection against the authority of the Fathers answered.

matters of great moment." These objections, I confess, against the ancient Fathers of the Church, and their authority in the settlement of ecclesiastical controversies, have been of late introduced. But whether they be true or false, is a point which we need not now discuss. For, even if we grant them true to the fullest extent, yet can no argument be drawn from them against our judgment concerning the *right use of the Fathers*. Inasmuch as we are speaking of the Fathers, not as individuals taken separately, but as taken all conjointly. And therefore how many errors soever may have been detected in one or more, and how much soever in some things, possibly of great moment, they may even disagree with one another, or at least may appear to disagree, yet our position remains firm enough and stable, since there are certainly, after allowance made for them, many things, on which an agreement prevails among all the Fathers universally, and very many, to which a majority of them have given their united assent. But all the dissensions which have been raised among them on certain subjects, take nothing from their supreme authority on those points in which they agree, but rather in an eminent degree confirm it. For the fact, that in other things they have differed, most plainly manifests, that those things on which they have agreed, they have handed down, not from any compact or agreement, not from any party formed, not from any communication of design, nor finally from their own private opinions, but naked and unadulterated, as derived from the common and general interpretation and Tradition of the Universal Church. And, indeed, although on certain less necessary points, as well of faith as of discipline, the ancient Fathers do in some little degree differ one from another, yet that very many things have been received with the fullest agreement by all, is so clear, that we may judge of it with our own eyes. For there are many things which we see have been defined by the Universal Church in Councils truly œcumenical, many things which have been approved by the consent of several, many things again by the consent of all the writers of the Church; many things, finally, concerning

which there was in ancient times no controversy moved, some of this class have been mentioned by us above, to which very many others may be added. Those especially which, although not definitively prescribed in holy Scripture, have yet been retained by our very pious and prudent Reformers of the English Church.

VI. For when this our English Church, through long communion with the Roman Church, had contracted like stains with her, from which it was necessary that it should be cleansed, they who took that excellent and very necessary work in hand, fearing that they, like others, might rush from one extreme to the other, removed indeed those things, as well doctrines as ceremonies, which the Roman Church had newly and insensibly superinduced, and, as was fit, abrogated them utterly. Yet notwithstanding, whatsoever things had been, at all times, believed and observed, by all Churches, in all places, those things they most religiously took care not so to abolish with them. For they well knew, that all particular Churches are to be formed on the model of the Universal Church, if indeed, according to that general and received rule in ethics, "every part which agreeth not with its whole is therein base." Hence therefore these first Reformers of this particular Church directed the whole line of that reformation, which they undertook, according to the rule of the whole or Universal Church, casting away those things only which had been either unheard of, or rejected by, the Universal Church, but most religiously retaining those which they saw, on the other side, corroborated by the consent of the Universal Church. Whence it hath been brought to pass, that although we have not communion with the Roman, nor with certain other particular Churches, as at this day constituted, yet have we abiding communion with the Universal and Catholic Church, of which evidently ours, as by the aid of God first constituted, and by His pity still preserved, is the perfect image and representation.

VII. But that we digress no further from our proposed object, when we are speaking of the *Universal Church*, and its agreement, without any doubt, regard is to be had

The Anglican Church was reformed on the Primitive Catholic model.

Great regard to be had to the Primitive Church.

especially to the *Primitive Church*: inasmuch as, although it be only a part of the whole, yet is it universally agreed that it was the more pure and genuine part. For the same hath happened to the Church, which hath happened to each several commonwealth, namely, that, ancient customs passing by degrees into disuse, new institutions are devised by the wanton imaginations of men's minds, which very fault is above all other to be eschewed in religion. For it is agreed among all Christians, that the Apostolic Church as constituted by the Apostles of our LORD in person, under the guidance of Divine inspiration, and by them whilst yet living administered, was of all Churches the purest and most perfect. Furthermore nothing seems more at variance with the common faith of Christians than that the doctrine or discipline instituted by the Apostles, should have been corrupted or any way changed by their immediate Successors. For all confess, that the Apostles were most faithful men, and of consequence willed to ordain none as their Successors, except those whose faith and integrity was fully approved by themselves personally. Therefore the first Successors of the Apostles doubtless kept inviolate and uncorrupted the Church, whose government had been entrusted to them; and in like manner handed it down to their own Successors, and these again to others, and so on; insomuch that there can exist no doubt, but that at least during two or three ages from the Apostles, the Church flourished in her primitive vigour, and so to say, in her virgin estate, that is in the same condition in which she had been left by the Apostles themselves; except that from time to time new heresies burst forth even in those days, by which the Church was indeed harassed, but in no way corrupted; clearly no more than the Church, strictly Apostolic, was perverted by those errors, which arose whilst the Apostles were yet living. For they had scarcely time to rise up, before they were rejected by the Catholic Church. Which things therefore, notwithstanding, the Universal Church which followed ever held that *Primitive Church* to be most pure, and, in refuting all heresies which afterwards arose, appealed to her as the rule of other Churches. For if any

one endeavoured to bring any thing new into the doctrine or discipline of the Church, those Fathers who opposed themselves to him, whether individually or assembled together in a body, sought their arguments as out of the holy Scriptures, so also out of the doctrines and traditions of the Church of the first ages. For this is observable in nearly all acts of Councils, and commentaries of individual Fathers, wherever, that is, ecclesiastical controversies are discussed. And, indeed, nothing still is more rational, nothing certainly more desirable, than that all particular Churches at this day, wherever constituted, were reformed after the model of the Primitive Church. For this measure would immediately cast forth whatever corruptions have crept in during later ages, and would restore to their ancient original, on the other hand, all things which are required for the true constitution of a Christian Church.—Translated (in the Introduction to the Oxford edition of the *Commonitory* of St. Vincent of Lirin) from Bp. Beveridge's Preface to *Codex Canonum Eccles. Prim. vindicatus ac illustratus*. Lond. 1678.

BULL, BISHOP AND DOCTOR.

B. 1634. D. 1710.

These men account us innovators because we recommend that all persons should study with diligence, and receive with veneration, the writings of ancient Doctors, approved by the Catholic Church, especially of those Doctors who bordered on the Apostolic age. These men account us innovators, because, next to the sacred Scriptures, we singly regard and revere the more pure and primitive antiquity; and because we advise others religiously to follow the consenting judgment of that antiquity, wherever discoverable, as it certainly is discoverable in all matters of greater moment; whilst in other matters, we leave each individual to the dictates of his own free judgment, saving ecclesiastical and Christian peace. And this, we are persuaded, is the best and only method of terminating those unhappy con-

troversies which, at the present day, have rent the Church of CHRIST into so many parties.

All persons, not absolutely strangers to our history, are aware that our Reformation was in all respects conformed to the example of the ancient Catholic Church. Hence in England the order of Bishops was retained, and the new regimen ecclesiastical, which by the counsels of Calvin took root in the neighbouring countries, was rejected. Hence our primitive Liturgical forms, our rites and religious ceremonies. Hence certain tenets of antiquity, though most abhorrent from the dogmas of Calvin, as for instance, of the universal redemption through CHRIST our SAVIOUR, of the defectibility of a justifying faith (of which in their own place), of the certain salvation of all infants born of Christian parents, baptized, and dying without the commission of actual sin ; so that from the very first constitution of our reformed Church, her sons may learn what deference is due to the judgment of the old Catholic Church. Hence, almost at the commencement of our Reformation, in the year 1571, was that remarkable Canon respecting preachers sanctioned by the consent of a full provincial Synod, and also confirmed by the authority of Elizabeth.¹ Hence among the directions and rules which, by the advice of the Bishops, the most wise monarch James, the successor of Elizabeth, recommended to the special care of the Vice-Chancellor, the Heads of the Colleges and Halls, the two Professors and Proctors in the University of Oxford, when the Puritanical faction was more than usually strong there, the following direction was inserted ; it is the *seventh in order* :—
“ That candidates of Theology be admonished to devote themselves to the study of such books as are most agreeable to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, that is, to give their time to reading the Fathers, Councils, School divines, ecclesiastical historians, and polemical writers ; and that they pay not so disproportionate attention to compendiums and manuals of divinity, as to make them the foundation of their theological studies.”

¹ See ante, p. 5, and note.

Hence the greatest of our divines have constantly and openly testified before all, that they entirely consented to the unanimous opinion of the ancient Doctors, and were against every thing in doctrine and discipline which was contrary to it. Thus the very learned SARAVIA (whom we may justly reckon in the number of our theologians), in the prologue of his Defence against Beza, says—"Nothing is to be brought in against the unanimous and unbroken agreement of all the Fathers of the ancient Church, but by the express word of GOD; for this I freely affirm, whosoever takes away altogether the authority of the Fathers, leaves none for himself." Again, he says in the same treatise—"This, Beza and those who are with him, deny, but not of this mind were the Fathers, and far be it from me to prefer the judgment of Beza, or Calvin, or any other of the Neoterics to their united voice, and to hold that the latter were void of wisdom, the former endowed with it." So the famous JEWEL, in his Apology—"We have come as near as we possibly could," &c.¹ So the most learned BILSON, against the Puritans—"That ye may not wrong us," he says, "we refuse nought of those things which the primitive and ancient Church of CHRIST ever approved or practised, as comprehended openly or by inference in the Scriptures. This is our custom." So also the great CASAUBON, as the advocate of our Church and King—"The King asserts with the Church of England, that he holds that doctrine to be true and necessary, which has been derived to our times from the Scriptures, through the channel of the ancient Church's consent." And the same in another place—"And if I do not err, the Reformation is most perfect in England, where to a love of truth is joined a love of antiquity." And in his own earnest manner MONTAGUE, in his *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*—"Our new divines, foolish youths as they are, recognise indeed this consent and unanimous suffrage of antiquity; but they are not influenced by regard to tradition. They say, indeed, that great veneration is due to the ancient Churches and holy Fathers; excellently said indeed. But why should I heed their speeches whilst I see their

¹ See ante, p. 25.

acts? when I see men of the lowest condition, who think themselves sages when they are no better than buffoons, not merely clamouring at, but insulting the hoary majesty of antiquity. But (say they) we ought to hear GOD rather than men; and they would say well, if GOD enjoined one thing and man another; but this is the matter in debate. It is their part to make out a proof, not to give sentence—nay, rather it does not admit of debate. We steadfastly maintain, against all the faction of innovators, that the ancients never did depart from GOD, never did dissent from His mind and word. They affirm—tush! what is the authority of these innovators, that when they please to affirm this or deny the other, we are to assent to them rather than to the Fathers? For when hath the SPIRIT of GOD ever departed from the Church, that they should stand up and gainsay the judgment of the Church?” In the same strain speaks JOSEPH HALL, his reverend successor in the same see (see Con. ad Clerum. 1623)—“Surely whoever willingly subscribes to the word of GOD,” &c.¹

Let us close this band of witnesses with our justly memorable HAMMOND. “The English Church,” he says, “stands forth before the whole Christian world with this distinctive feature, a feature by which she will equally deserve the commendation of posterity, that in deciding controversies relating either to faith or practice, she always firmly maintained this rule (and on this basis willed that the British Reformation should rest), that the highest authority should be attributed to the Scriptures, and the next degree of veneration be conceded to the Bishops, Martyrs, and Ecclesiastical writers of the primitive ages.” From all which it is manifest who are to be accounted innovators if we are to follow *the judgment of the principal Theologians in our Church, and so of the Church herself*; namely, those who strike out opinions at variance with the unanimous voice of the ancient prelates of the Church, or who change the universally received regimen of the Catholic Church.

Here then I take my stand; let my antagonist, Tully,

¹ See ante, p. 75.

produce out of my Harmony, after a thorough examination, but one proposition, which I have defended, which is repugnant to the decisions of the ancient Catholic Church, and I will forthwith acknowledge myself conquered; I will instantly admit that I am most justly branded by him with the infamy of an innovator; I will not hesitate openly and publicly to retract my error or heresy and to repeat my palinodia before the whole Christian world, and will for ever give satisfaction for my heterodoxy and rashness, by the silence both of the tongue and the pen, after the example of Sulpicius.—*Apology for Harmony, &c. Works. Oxford, 1827. Vol. IV. pp. 308—313.*

As for the fundamental principles of the Christian religion, undoubtedly delivered in the Scriptures, and allowed (except the Romanists, who have so affected singularity, as to frame to themselves a new Christianity,) by the whole Church of God, they are by the consent of all Christians acknowledged to be contained in that called the Creed, or rule of faith.

The Anglican rule of faith.

This rule of faith, and *that also as it is more fully explained by the first General Councils*, our Church heartily embraceth, and hath made a part of her Liturgy, and so hath *obliged* all her sons to make solemn profession thereof.—*Ibid. Vol. II. p. 213. A Vindication of the Church of England.*

GRABE, PRIEST AND CONFESSOR.

B. 1666. D. 1712.

It is the contempt of the Ecclesiastical Tradition, reaching down from the Apostolic age to our own, which causes Christians who are called to one faith and to one hope, to split into various sects, each of which professes Scripture for its rule of faith, but bends our LORD's declarations to its private likings and wishes, and refuses communion to all who differ from it, depriving them of all privileges,

Contempt of Tradition the cause of Schism.

bodily and spiritual. On one side, upon traditions truly Catholic and Apostolic, are superadded new opinions and superstitions which falsely pretend to the name; on the other, that is torn away, overlooked, nay, sometimes rejected, which has been believed and practised in the Church *always, every where, and by all*, and for this sole reason, because it is inconsistent with the new decrees and determinations, or altogether hostile to them. Meanwhile, till public peace is restored to the world, we must see to our own private peace and safety, lest we be involved in the afore-mentioned evils, and perish in the ruin of others. We shall escape this mischief if we build ourselves upon the faith once delivered to the Saints, and best unfolded in the writings of the ancient Fathers, not admitting aught which beyond or against it be latterly added, uncertain, false, vain, superstitious, idolatrous, not agreeing with those who detract from the traditions of the Catholic Church, and contentiously revile the most ancient doctrine and discipline, nay, those who do not obey it with their whole heart.—*Præfat. in Spicileg.*

The form of
the Eucha-
ristic Conse-
cration an
Apostolical
tradition.

The form of consecration and opinion of the consecrated elements, in which both Catholics and heretics, in the age immediately succeeding the holy Apostles, have agreed together, and which, ever since, has been kept in all ancient Churches, and is by some of the Fathers expressly reckoned amongst the unwritten Apostolical traditions, and is moreover hinted at in the very writings of the New Testament, cometh undoubtedly from the Apostles, if not from our LORD himself, and ought, therefore, by no means to be changed, otherwise it will make the consecration doubtful, or at least unlawful for them that understand this matter. It is, therefore, an indispensable duty, incumbent upon every Christian Church, and every priest in it, strictly to keep to the same matter and form which our LORD JESUS CHRIST and His holy Apostles have used in the first institution and celebration of this sacred mystery, and to do it and with it what these have done, lest if they diminish or take aught off it, they should lose either the

substance or the benefit of this most holy Sacrament; and consequently, if through ignorance or mistake a fault or defect hath happened anywhere in these things, it is the bounden duty of the Bishops and priests of that Church to rectify the same, the received customs and human laws notwithstanding; and of every one who, by reading the holy Scriptures and writings of the ancient Apostolical Fathers, is come to the knowledge of such fault or defect, to put them in mind of it, and to show the same in order that it may be amended, since every one who knoweth the truth and doth not declare it, shall be judged by the LORD on the last day.—*De formâ Consecrationis Eucharistiæ*, pp. 75, 84.

SHARPE, ARCHBISHOP.

B. 1644. D. 1714.

We see from hence how groundlessly, how unreasonably, we Protestants are charged with heresy by our adversaries. They make no scruple of calling us heretics, and telling us we shall be damned upon that account, unless we come over to their belief. Why, what is it they would have us believe? We believe all that JESUS CHRIST and His Apostles taught to the world, so far as we have knowledge of it. We believe all the holy Scriptures, and not only so, but we make them the rule of our faith. We believe all those articles of faith into which all Christians in every country, from CHRIST's time to this, have been baptized, and which by all the ancients have been accounted a perfect summary of the Christian faith; nor do we hold any thing inconsistent with them. We own both CHRIST's Sacraments; and we administer them entirely. We renounce all the heresies that were condemned by the ancient General Councils; nay, we are ready to refer ourselves to those Councils, and to the primitive Fathers who lived at that time, for the trial of all the points which are disputed between us. And lastly, we are sure we are not obstinate in our errors, if they should prove so; we are sure we have no secular ends to serve in the maintaining them;

The Anglican Church orthodox, in the sense of holy Scripture and the Fathers.

and most of all sure we are, that we are not self-condemned, that our own conscience doth not accuse us for being of this way; (which yet is one of those things that go to the making of an heretic). Now if all these things can be truly said of us, (as I think they may be truly said of the Church of England, and of all the honest members of it,) how is it possible that we can in any sense be guilty of heresy? In the sense of the Scriptures and of the Fathers I am sure we are orthodox Christians; and in the sense of the greatest Divines, even in the Roman Communion, I am sure we are no heretics. And if after all that, we must be branded with that name, all that we can say is, that “after the way which they call heresy, so worship we the God of our Fathers.”—*Sermons*, Vol. VI. p. 5.

TENISON, ARCHBISHOP.

B. 1636. D. 1715.

Of the
respect
which the
Anglican
Church
pays to the
Church
Universal.

Though the Reformed, especially those of the Church of England, see no necessity for an infallible guide, nor believe there is one on the face of the earth, yet *they do not reject all Ecclesiastical guidance*; but allow it great place in matters of discipline and order, and some place also (though not that of an unerring *judge*) in matters of faith. At the beginning of the Reformation, the Protestants, though they refused the judgment of the Pope, their enemy, yet they declined not the determination of a Council. And, in the assembly at Augsburg, the Romanists and Protestants agreed in a Council as the Umpire of their public difference. At this the Pope was so alarmed (saith the Sieur de Mezeray, Hist. Fran. A. D. 1530), that he wrote to the Kings of France and England, “that he would do all they would desire, provided they hindered the calling of a Council.”

In the Reformation of the Church of England, *great regard was had to the Primitive Fathers and Councils*. And the aforesaid French historian was as much mistaken in the affairs of our Church, when he said of our Religion,

that it was a *medley of the opinions of Calvin and Luther* (Mez. Hist. A. 1548), as he was afterwards in the affairs of our State, when he said King James was elected at the Guildhall King of England (*Id. ib.* A. 1603). The Romanists represent us very falsely, whilst they fix upon us a private spirit, as it stands in opposition to the authority of the Catholic Church. Mr. Alabaster expresseth one motive to his conversion to the Roman Church in these words: "Weigh together the Spouse of CHRIST with Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Œcumenical Councils, with private opinions; the reverend and learned Fathers with Arius, Aetius, Vigilantius, men always in their time burned for Heretics" (of which words, the former are false reasoning, the latter are false history). The Bishop of Meaux reasons after the same fallacious manner: "Supposing a Protestant to be of this persuasion, that he can understand the Scriptures better than all the rest of the Church together;" of which persuasion he saith very truly, that *it exalteth pride and removeth docility*.

The *Guide in Controversies* puts the question wrong in these terms—"Whether a Protestant, in refusing the submission of his judgment to the authority or infallibility of the Catholic Church in her Councils, can have, in several articles of necessary faith, wherein the sense of Scripture is controverted, as sure a foundation of his faith, as he who submits his judgment to the aforesaid authority, or also infallibility?" Here the Catholic Church is put in place of the *Roman*, authority and infallibility are joined together; and it is suggested *dishonestly* concerning the Reformed, that *they lay aside the authority of the Catholic Church in her General Councils*. Authority may be owned where there is no infallibility; for it is not in parents natural or civil, yet both teach and govern us. If others reject Church authority, let them who are guilty of such disorderly irreverence, see to it. The Christians of the Church of England are of another spirit. We make confession of the ancient faith expressed in the Apostolical, Nicene or Constantinopolitan, and Athanasian Creeds. The Canons of forty reject the heresy of Socinus, as contrary to the

first four General Councils (*Can. V.*)¹ Our very Statute-Book hath respect to them in the judging of heresy (1 Eliz. 1).² Yet our Church still teacheth concerning them (Art. XXI.) that “things by them ordained have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture.”—*A Discourse concerning a Guide in matters of faith*, c. vi.—*Gibson’s Preservative*. Tit. IV. c. i. p. 15.

HICKES, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.

B. 1642. D. 1715.

“We [the Romanists] follow the guidance of the Church, they [the Anglicans] their own.” It is great arrogance in you, to say you follow the guidance of the Church. If that be true, will you show us your Religion, wherein it differs from ours, in the purest ages of the Church for the first five hundred years? You have asked me, where our Religion was nine hundred or a thousand years before Luther; and I have showed you where it then was, even where the Popish part of your Religion then was not, all over the Christian world, particularly in the Church of England; and if you cannot show me the like of your Religion, then it is impossible you should follow the guidance of the Church. If you follow the guidance of the Church, you would have Catholic Tradition, and the Scripture expounded by Catholic Tradition, on your side. But Catholic Tradition, which consists in Antiquity, Universality and Consent, is against you; for instead of Antiquity, you have set up novelty; instead of Universality, your own particular traditions; and instead of Consent, only the testimony and authority of your own representative Church in the Council of Trent, whose definitions you miscall the guidance of the Church. . . . And truly you follow the guidance of the Church, in following that Council, as much as that Council followed the guidance of the HOLY GHOST, in following the Pope; and how much that was, let its own

¹ See ante, pp. 4, 5.

² See ante, pp. 3, 4.

definitions and the Creed of Pius IV. speak. On the contrary, *we* follow both the example and guidance of the Church. Its example, in making use of our own right to call a national Synod for Reformation, when we could not obtain it by a General Council; and its guidance, in making *SCRIPTURE expounded by CATHOLIC TRADITION, our RULE OF FAITH.* We follow Antiquity, Universality, and Consent, and therefore we follow the Church, the primitive Church; to her and her General Councils we appeal against you and your particular Council of Trent, and by the consentient doctrines of her Fathers, we offer, we desire to be tried.—*Letters to a Popish Priest*, pp. 171—174. Edit. 1705.

SOUTH, PRIEST.

B. 1633. D. 1716.

And so we come to the second extreme mentioned; under which, as an angel of light, he [the Devil] more directly strikes at the practice of religion; and that is enthusiasm. The abuse of private judgment condemned. A thing not more detestable in its effects, than plausible in its occasion. For men being enraged at the magisterial imposing of traditions upon them, as a rule of faith equal to the written Word, and being commanded withal to submit their reason to the cheat of an infallible interpreter, they too naturally struck off to his extreme, to slight and lay aside the judgment of all antiquity, and so to adhere only to the bare letter of the Scripture; and then, both to secure and authorize their errors, they made their own reason, or rather humour, (first surnaming it the SPIRIT,) the infallible, unappealable judge of all that was delivered in the written Word. And now upon these terms, what could keep a man so disposed from coming over to Socinianism; since the prime art and engine made use of by Socinus himself, for the venting of all his abominations, was a professed defiance of the judgment of all antiquity in matters of religion? And what likewise could hinder a man (if his temper inclined that way) from taking up in anabaptism, when he could neither find any clear precept for infant baptism, nor express instance of it in the Scripture; but only probable inferences from thence, and remote

consequences; all of them perhaps too little, without the Universal Tradition of the Church, to found the necessity and perpetuity of such a practice upon? Especially having been encountered by such specious objections, as have been too often produced against it. And thus we see how both the fore-mentioned extremes commence upon one and the same principle; to wit, the laying aside the judgment of antiquity, both in matters of faith, and in all expositions of Scripture.—*Sermon on 2 Cor. xi. 14.*

LESLIE, PRIEST AND CONFESSOR.

B. 1650. D. 1722.

The consent
of all ages
and
Churches
gives us an
infallible
assurance of
the faith.

But though we think no Church to be infallible, yet, we have an infallible assurance of the faith, in its being delivered down to us, by such an universal consent of all ages and churches, as that it was not in their power, though they should be supposed so wicked as to design it, at such vast distance, even when all correspondence was stopped, to have combined together, and all agree in the self-same doctrine, if it had not been the same which was taught them from the beginning. And the rise of heresies does rather confirm the truth of this: because such were found to be novelties, and to go against the Universal Tradition, which whatever has (according to the rule of Vincentius Lirinensis, *quod semper, ubique, ab omnibus*) we willingly receive; and what has not this evidence, we cannot admit of as faith.—*Answer to Bossuet.—Theol. Works, Vol. I. p. 581.*¹

Ibid.

There is a tradition which (for the evidence of it) we are willing to admit; that is, according to the rule of Vincentius Lirinensis, *quod semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*, “That which was always received everywhere and by all.” And we are willing to join issue with you upon this Tradition as to purgatory: this is Universal Tradition: and you would not desire we should be concluded by any particular tradition of this or that Church or place; for you know there are many deceits in such. But Veron, in his rule of faith, (a

¹ Vide Bp. Jebb's Occasional Sermons, Appendix, p. 396.

book much applauded in France, and put into English for the use of the Roman Catholics here,) sets out in the beginning with a definition of the rule of faith; of which he makes the first requisite to be, for an article of faith, that it be clearly revealed in Scripture (and by no pretended revelation since, to any whatsoever) in express words, or thence to be deduced by necessary consequence: which when made appear as to purgatory, (or any other of the doctrines in dispute,) we shall readily allow it; and till then we cannot be arraigned of heresy for not professing to believe it.—*The case stated between the Church of Rome and the Church of England.*—*Works*, Vol. III. pp. 156, 157. Oxford, 1832.

BINGHAM, PRIEST.

B. 1668. D. 1723.

If it be now inquired what Articles of faith, and what points of practice were reckoned thus fundamental, or essential to the very being of a Christian, and the union of many Christians into one body or Church, the Ancients are very plain in resolving this: for as to Fundamental Articles of faith, the Church had them always collected or summed up out of Scripture in her Creeds, the profession of which was ever esteemed both necessary, on the one hand, and sufficient on the other, in order to the admission of members into the Church by baptism, and, consequently, both necessary and sufficient to keep men in the unity of the Church, so far as concerns the unity of faith generally required of all Christians, to make them one body and one Church of Believers. Upon this account; as I have had occasion to show in a former book, the Creed was commonly called by the ancients the *κανὼν* and *regula fidei*, because it was the known standard or rule of faith, by which orthodoxy and heresy were judged and examined. If a man adhered to this rule he was deemed an orthodox Christian, and in the union of the Catholic faith; but if he deviated from it in any point, he was esteemed as one that cut himself off, and separated from the communion of

What are
Fundamen-
tals.

the Church, by entertaining heretical opinions and deserting the common faith. Thus the Fathers in the Council of Antioch charge Paulus Samosatensis with departing from the rule of Canon, meaning the Creed, the rule of faith, because he denied the divinity of CHRIST. Irenæus (lib. i. cap. i. p. 44) calls it the unalterable Canon or rule of faith, and says (*Ibid.* cap. iii.) This faith was the same in all the world, men professed it with one heart and one soul; for though there were different dialects in the world, yet the power of faith was one and the same. The Churches in Germany had no other faith or tradition than those in Spain, or in France, or in the East, or Egypt, or Libya. Nor did the most eloquent ruler of the Church say any more than this, for no one was above his master, nor the weakest diminish any thing of this tradition. For the faith being one and the same, he that said most of it could not enlarge it, nor he that said least, take any thing from it. So Tertullian says (*De Veland. Virgin. cap. i.*), There is one rule of faith only, which admits of no change or alteration, "That which teaches us to believe in one GOD Almighty, the Maker of the world, and in JESUS CHRIST His SON, &c." This rule, he says, (*De Præscript. adv. Hæret.*) was instituted by CHRIST Himself, and there were no disputes in the Church about it, but such as heretics brought in, or such as made heretics; to know nothing beyond this, was to know all things. This faith (*cont. Prax. cap. ii.*) was the rule of believing from the beginning of the Gospel, and the antiquity of it was sufficiently demonstrated by the novelty of heresies, which were but of yesterday's standing in comparison of it. Cyprian says, (*Ep. 69, al. 76, ad Magnum. p. 183,*) It was the law which the whole Catholic Church held, and that the Novatians themselves baptized into the same Creed, though they differed about the sense of the Article relating to the Church. Therefore Novatian in his book of the TRINITY (*cap. i. § 4,*) makes no scruple to give the Creed the same name, *regula veritatis*, the rule of truth. And St. Jerome (*Ep. liv. ad Marcellam*) after the same manner, disputing against the errors of the Montanists, says, The first thing they differed about was the rule of faith. For

the Church believed the FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST, to be each distinct in His own Person, though united in substance. But the Montanists, following the doctrine of Sabellius, contracted the TRINITY into one Person. From all which it is evident, that the fundamental Articles of faith were those which the Primitive Church summed up in her Creeds, in the profession of which she admitted men as members into the unity of her body by baptism; and if any deserted or corrupted this faith, they were no longer reputed Christians, but heretics, who brake the unity of the Church by breaking the unity of the faith, though they had otherwise made no farther separation from her Communion. For as Clemens Alexandrinus says, (Strom. lib. ii.) out of Hermes' Pastor, (lib. i. Vision iii. cap. 8,) faith is the virtue that binds and unites the Church together. Whence Hegesippus, the ancient historian, giving an account of the old heretics, says, (Ap. Euseb. lib. iv. cap. 22,) They divided the unity of the Church by pernicious speeches against God and His CHRIST; that is, by denying some of the prime, fundamental Articles of faith. He that makes a breach upon any one of these, cannot maintain the unity of the Church, nor his own character as a Christian. We ought, therefore, says Cyprian, (Ep. lxxi. ad Quintum, p. 194) in all things to hold the unity of the Catholic Church, and not to yield in any thing to the enemies of faith and truth. For he cannot (De Unit. Eccles. p. 114) be thought a Christian who continues not in the truth of CHRIST'S Gospel and faith. If men be heretics, says Tertullian, (De Præscrip. cap. xxxvii.) they cannot be Christians. The like is said by Lactantius, and Jerome, and Athanasius, and Hilary, and many others of the ancients, whose sense upon this matter I have fully represented in another place. As, therefore, there was an unity of faith necessary to be maintained in certain fundamental Articles, in order to make a man a Christian, so these Articles were always to be found in the Church's Creeds; the profession of which was esteemed keeping the unity of the faith; and deviating in any point from them, was esteemed a breach of that one faith, and a

virtual departing from the unity of the Church.—*Antiquities of the Christian Church*, Vol. II. pp. 2, 3. Fol. 1726.

How
different
Churches
maintained
communion
with one
another.
First, in
faith.

We are next to examine what communion different Churches held with one another, that we may discover the harmonious unity of the Catholic Church. And here first of all we are to observe, that as there was one common faith, consisting of certain fundamental Articles, essential to the very being of a particular Church and its unity, and the being of a Christian; so this same faith was necessary to unite the different parts of the Catholic Church, and make them one body of Christians. So that if any Church deserted or destroyed this faith in whole or in part, they were looked upon as rebels and traitors against CHRIST, and enemies to the common faith, and treated as a conventicle of heretics, and not of Christians. Upon this account every Bishop not only made a declaration of his faith at his ordination, before the Provincial Synod that ordained him, but also sent his circular or encyclical letters, as they were called, to foreign Churches, to signify that he was in communion with them. And this was so necessary a thing in a Bishop newly ordained, that Liberatus (*Breviar. cap. xvii.*) tells us, the omission of it was interpreted a sort of refusal to hold communion with the rest of the world, and a virtual charge of heresy upon himself or them.

Secondly,
in mutual
assistance of
each other
for defence
of the com-
mon faith.

To maintain this unity of faith entire, every Church was ready to give each other their mutual assistance to oppose all fundamental errors, and beat down heresy at its first appearance among them. The whole world in this respect was but one common Diocese, the Episcopate was an universal thing, and every Bishop had his share in it in such a manner as to have an equal concern in the whole; as I have more fully showed in another place, where I observed, that in things not appertaining to the faith, Bishops were not to meddle with other men's Dioceses, but only to mind the business of their own: but when the faith or welfare of the Church lay at stake, and religion was manifestly invaded, then, by this rule, of there being but one Episcopacy, every other Bishopric was as much their Diocese as their own; and no human Laws or Canons

could tie up their hands from performing such acts of the Episcopal office in any part of the world, as they thought necessary for the preservation of faith and Religion. This was the ground of their meeting in Synods, Provincial, National, and sending their joint opinions and advice from one Church to another. The greatest part of Church History is made up of such acts as these, so that it were next to impertinent to refer to any particulars. I only observe one thing farther upon this head, that the intermeddling with other men's concerns, which would have been accounted a real breach of unity in many other cases, was in this case thought so necessary, that there was no certain way to preserve the unity of the Catholic Church and faith without it. And as an instance of this, I have noted in the fore-cited book, that though it was against the ordinary rule of the Church for any Bishop to ordain in another man's Diocese, yet in case a Bishop turned heretic, and persecuted the Orthodox, and would ordain none but heretical men to establish heresy in his Diocese, in that case any orthodox Bishop was not only authorized, but obliged, as opportunity served, and the needs of the Church required, to ordain Catholic teachers in such a Diocese, to oppose the malignant designs of the enemy, and stop the growth of heresy, which might otherwise take deep root, and spread and overrun the Church. Thus Athanasius and the famous Eusebius of Samosata went about the world in the prevalency of the Arian heresy, ordaining in every Church where they came, such clergy as were necessary to support the orthodox cause in such a time of distress and desolation; and this was so far from being reckoned a breach of the Church's unity, though against the letter of a Canon in ordinary cases, that it was necessary to be done, in such a state of affairs, to maintain the unity of the Catholic faith, which every Bishop was obliged to defend, not only in his own Diocese, but in all parts of the world, by virtue of that rule which obliges Bishops in weighty affairs to take care of the Catholic Church, and requires all Churches in time of danger to give mutual aid and assistance to one another.—*Ibid.* pp. 14, 15.

WHITBY, PRIEST.

B. 1638. D. 1726.

We are bound to reject such doctrines as have been rejected by the Catholic Church.

In such doctrines as were rejected by the *Universal Church* as *heresies*, Austin saith truly, that it was sufficient cause to reject them, because *the Church held the contrary*, they being such as did *oppose* her rule of faith or symbol universally received; and that it was sufficient to persuade any man, he *ought not* to embrace any of the doctrines of *heretics*, as articles of faith, because the Church, who could not be *deficient* in any point of *necessary faith*, did not receive them. This way of arguing *negatively*, we therefore, with St. Austin, do allow: the Universal Church knows no such doctrine; *ergo*, it is no article I am obliged to receive as any part of Christian faith.—*Treatise of Tradition*. Part II. cap. 12, p. 131. Edit. 1689.

COLLIER, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.

B. 1650. D. 1726.

Tradition.

To deny the sufficiency of early and general Tradition, is not only an unsupported, but a dangerous way of arguing: The reasons of my assertion are these.

Infant Baptism.

1st, I desire to know, which way we can prove the necessity, or indeed the lawfulness of infant baptism, without the help of Jewish and Christian Tradition? There is no demonstrative evidence in Scripture, either of command or instance for this practice. 'Tis said by our SAVIOUR, that "he who believes, and is baptized, shall be saved" (St. Mark xvi. 16); but where is it plainly written, that those who are incapable of believing, have a right to baptism? The text, 1 Cor. vii. 14, which seems to speak most to this purpose; the meaning of this text, I say, is expounded to different senses, not only by our modern Antipædobaptists, but by Tertullian, and some other ancient writers. (See Wall's History of Infant Baptism, Edit. 2d, pp. 68, 175, 532.) What is it then that warrants the practice, and contributes to justify the necessity, but primitive usage and consentient *Tradition*?

2dly, I would ask this gentleman, upon what grounds the keeping Sunday instead of Saturday is defensible? The Scripture has nothing determining. The Apostles were *daily* in the Temple, went into the Synagogues, and preached on the *Sabbath* (Acts ii. 46; xiii. 14); but they left us no command for translating the festival from the seventh to the first day. To support this alteration, we must have recourse to the testimonies of St. Barnabas, and St. Justin Martyr (St. Barnab. Epis. cap. xv.; St. Justin. Mart. Apol. ii.), and to the general custom of the ages following.

3dly, 'Tis from *Tradition* we are assured the Books of the Old and New Testament are Divine Revelation. 'Tis true, we are bound to believe the Word of God without scruple, without the motive of ecclesiastical authority. But then 'tis Church authority, which brings evidence for this Revelation, and enables us to distinguish between the inspired Writings and human compositions. For the purpose: we believe the Books of the New Testament inspired Writings, because those who were contemporary with the Apostles, those who lived with such contemporaries, and all succeeding ages, have received them as such. Either we must rest the motives of credibility upon human testimony, or lie open to the delusion of a private spirit. And thus we shall either wander through enthusiasm, or want a new inspiration to prove the old one. All rational grounds of belief, to those who lived *posterior* to the Apostles, must rest upon human testimony; that is, upon the general uninterrupted conveyance from the Apostolical to the present age; and what is this but *Traditionary* evidence? Could we succeed against the force of *Tradition*, the issue of the victory would prove very unhappy. Thus we should shake the main pillars, and sap the foundations of Religion. This would cancel the credit of all records both human and Divine, drag us towards scepticism, and scarcely suffer our assent any farther than our senses can carry us.

4thly. *Tradition* stands recommended by Scripture itself. These two conveyances are not opposite and destructive of each other. They are no more than different ways of publishing

The change
of the
Sabbath.

The
Canonicity
of the Old
and New
Testament.

Catholic
Tradition
is recom-
mended
by holy
Scripture.

the will of God, and only two streams flowing from the same fountain. And therefore when the current of Tradition runs clear and strong, we ought to follow it. This is no less than the Apostles' direction in several places. For instance, St. Paul commands the Corinthians to "keep fast the *Ordinances* as he delivered them to them." (1 Cor. xi. 2.) But then these Ordinances are not to be met with in his Epistles; they refer only to what he preached, not to what he had written to them. Thus he exhorts the Thessalonians, to "stand fast, and hold the *traditions* which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle." (2 Thess. ii. 15.) Thus we see the *traditions* they had been taught by *word of mouth*, were to be held no less than those conveyed by writing. And the same Apostle gives the same charge to Timothy: "Hold fast," says he, "the Form of sound words, which thou hast *heard* of me." (2 Tim. i. 13.) From hence 'tis plain, that if we are governed by *Scripture*, we must be governed by *Tradition* too. Tradition, when rightly stated, is an unexceptionable rule; and to argue against it is in effect to maim the directions for duty, and make one part of the will of God clash with another.—*Reasons for restoring some Prayers and Directions as they stand in the Liturgy of Edward VI. &c.* pp. 15—19. 2d Edit.

Remarks on
2 Tim. iii.
16, 17.

This learned author cites a text (2 Tim. iii. 16, 17) to prove St. Paul gives us directions to stick to Scripture, as of itself sufficient to lead us to salvation. In this, with Archbishop Laud, I agree with him, so far as to acknowledge that the Scripture *interpreted by the Catholic Church of the first four or five centuries*, is sufficient to lead us to salvation. But then I must subjoin, that this text is misapplied, and falls short of this gentleman's purpose. For, 1st, The Scripture St. Paul refers to, is the Old Testament; as appears by his putting St. Timothy in mind that "from a child he had known the holy Scriptures," (ver. 15.) Now, when St. Timothy was a child, very little, if any part of the New Testament, was written: 'tis therefore the *Jewish Canon* which is plainly pointed at in this place. This

Scripture the Apostle tells his disciple was “able to make him wise unto salvation through faith in CHRIST JESUS.” That is, by reading the Old Testament, he might see the predictions and character of the Messiah plainly answered in our blessed SAVIOUR. And that these prophecies, thus fulfilled, were good arguments of the truth of Christianity.

2dly. When St. Paul penned this epistle to St. Timothy, several parts of the New Testament were not communicated by writing. And of these, if we can go no farther, we may reckon the Gospel and Epistles of St. John, together with the Revelation. If, therefore, what was written before, was sufficient, won’t these later writings appear somewhat unnecessary? And will any body be so hardy as to affirm this?

3dly. To suppose St. Paul confined St. Timothy to *written direction*, is to make the Apostle enjoin contradictions, and that in the same chapter (2 Tim. iii. 2). For here he commands him to “commit to faithful men the things that he had *heard* of him among many witnesses.” ’Tis likewise direct clashing with what he had commanded in the first chapter of the same epistle. (2 Tim. i. 13.) And thus we see this text is altogether unserviceable to what our author produced it.—*A Vindication of the Reasons and Defence, &c.* Part I. pp. 11—13. Edit. 1718.

JENKIN, PRIEST.

B. 1656. D. 1727.

Christians are not only agreed in the main that the Gospel is true, but they are likewise agreed in the sense and meaning of it, as to the fundamental Articles necessary to salvation. This was the ancient rule and measure laid down by Vincentius Lirinensis, of the Catholic Doctrine necessary to be believed, that it hath been believed in *all ages, in all places, and in all Churches.*—*The reasonableness and certainty of the Christian Religion.* Book II. c. xxxii.

The rule of
St. Vincent.

WAKE, ARCHBISHOP.

B. 1657. D. 1737.

Of the Word
written and
unwritten.

Our blessed SAVIOUR having founded His Church upon the Word which He preached, we confess, that the unwritten Word, as to that Gospel which He preached, was *the first* rule of Christians. But GOD Almighty foreseeing how liable such a rule must have been to infinite inconveniences, thought fit to have that Word which was first spoken by mouth, afterwards consigned to writing. By which means the Word written and unwritten were not two different rules, but as to all necessary matters of faith, one and the same: and the unwritten Word, so far from *losing its authority*, that it was indeed the more fully established, by being thus delivered to us by the holy Apostles and Evangelists.

We receive with the *same veneration* whatsoever comes from the Apostles, *whether by Scripture or Tradition*, provided that we can be assured that it comes from them. And if it can be made appear, that any tradition which the written Word contains not, has been received by *all Churches*, and in *all ages*, we are ready to embrace it as coming from the Apostles.

Monsieur de Meaux, therefore, ought not to charge us as enemies to *Tradition*, but only *those things which they pretend to have received by it*; but which we suppose to be so far from being the doctrine of the Apostles, or of all Churches in all ages, that we are persuaded they are many of them directly contrary to the *written Word*, which is by themselves confessed to be the Apostles' doctrine, and which the best and purest ages of the Church adhered to.—*An Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England. Part III. Art. XXV.—Gibson's Preservative. Tit. IX. pp. 43, 44.*

WATERLAND, PRIEST AND DOCTOR.

B. 1683. D. 1741.

Scripture
and
Antiquity.

There is no occasion for magnifying *Antiquity* at the expense of *Scripture*; neither is that the way to do real

honour to either, but to expose both; as it is sacrificing their reputation to serve the ends of novelty and error. Antiquity ought to attend as an handmaid to Scripture, to wait upon her as her mistress, and to observe her; to keep off intruders from making too bold with her, and to discourage strangers from misrepresenting her.

. . . . I come to mention some more peculiar and eminent views, in which the ancientest Fathers may be exceeding useful, for fixing the sense of Scripture in controverted texts. Those that lived in or near the Apostolic times might retain in memory what the Apostles themselves, or their immediate Successors, thought and said upon such and such points. And though there is no trusting, in such case, to *oral* Tradition distinct from Scripture, nor to *written*, disagreeing with Scripture; yet written accounts, consonant to Scripture, are of use to confirm and strengthen Scripture, and to ascertain its true meaning.

Mr. Bayle allows that, “in the days of the Apostles, or their *first disciples*, it had been easy to discover those who gave the Scriptures a wrong interpretation; because the infallibility of the Apostles, (who might have been consulted by word or by letter,) and the *fresh remembrance* of the verbal instructions they had given their disciples and pastors whom *themselves* had consecrated, was a ready means of clearing any doubt or disputed point.” (Bayle’s Supplement to Philosophical Commentary, p. 692.) It appears then to be on all hands agreed, that those *most early* Fathers are competent witnesses of the Doctrine of the Church in their days; nay, and of the Doctrine also of CHRIST and his Apostles, to whom they immediately succeeded: and therefore their general sense is of signal use (so far as it reaches) to ascertain the interpretation of Scripture, and more especially as being consonant to the *easy* and *natural* import of the words themselves.—*On the HOLY TRINITY*, c. vii.—*Works*, Vol. V. pp. 261—263. Edit. Oxford, 1823.

The next consideration is this, that a very particular regard is due to the *public acts* of the ancient Church,

appearing in *Creeds* made use of in baptism, and in the *censures* passed upon heretics; and the observable *harmony* and *unanimity* of the several Churches, in such acts, is a circumstance which adds irresistible force to them. It is not at all likely, that any *whole* Church of those early times should vary from Apostolical Doctrine in things of moment; but it is, morally speaking, absurd to imagine, that *all the churches* should combine in the same error, and conspire together to corrupt the doctrine of CHRIST. This is the argument which Irenæus and Tertullian insist upon, and triumph in, over the heretics of their times: and it is obliquely glanced upon by Hegesippus and Clemens Alexandrinus, of the same second century, and by Origen also of the third. The argument was undoubtedly true and just, as it then stood, while there were no breaks in the succession of Doctrine, but a perfect unanimity of the Churches all along in the prime Articles; though, afterwards, the force of this argument came to be obscured, and almost lost, by taking in things foreign to it, and blending it with what happened in later times. The force of it could last no longer than such unanimity lasted. I say, while the Churches were all *unanimous* in the main things (as they were in Irenæus's time, and Tertullian's, and for more than a century after), that very *unanimity* was a presumptive argument that their faith was right, derived down to them from the Apostles themselves. For it was highly unreasonable to suppose, that those several Churches, very distant from each other in places, and of different languages, and under no common visible head, should all *unite* in the same *errors*, and *deviate* uniformly from their rule at once. But that they should all agree in the same *common faith*, might easily be accounted for, as arising from the same *common cause*, which could be no other but the *common delivery* of the same uniform faith and Doctrine to all the Churches by the Apostles themselves. Such *unanimity* could never come by *chance*, but must be derived from one common source, and therefore the *harmony* of their Doctrine was in itself a pregnant argument of the truth of it. As to the fact, that the Churches were thus unanimous in all the prime things,

in those days, Irenæus, who was a very knowing person, and who had come far east to settle in the west, bears ample testimony to it. Tertullian, in the two passages last cited from him, testifies the same thing, as to the unanimity of the Churches of those times in the fundamentals of Christian Doctrine. Hegesippus, contemporary with Irenæus, gives much the same account of the succession of true Doctrine, down to his own time, in the several Churches. Clemens of Alexandria means the same thing, where he recommends the faith of the Universal Church as *one*, and as more ancient than heresies. And Origen, of the third century, testifies the same of the Church in his time, and argues in the same manner from it. Irenæus and Tertullian were both of them so strongly persuaded of the certainty, first of the fact, and next of the inference from it, that they scrupled not to urge it as a very full and convincing proof of the Apostolical faith singly considered, and abstracting from Scripture proof; an argument which there is no need to be jealous of, if it be but rightly understood, and limited to such circumstances as it was grounded upon. For the meaning was not, that Apostolical Churches could never err, nor that Tradition would be always a safe rule to go by; but such tradition as that was, which might easily be traced up to the Apostles, by the help of writings then extant (as easily as we may now trace up the Doctrine of our Church to the reign of Charles, or of James the First), such a tradition might be depended upon. Besides that, the unanimity of the Churches all the world over (which could not be rationally accounted for on any other supposition but that they had been so taught from the beginning) confirmed the same thing. The argument in this light, and in those circumstances, was a very good one.¹ But when those circum-

¹ "Now whatever may be the case with other Protestant Churches, I see nothing in Tertullian's reasoning [de Præsc. Hæret.] at variance with the maxims of the Church of England, respecting the use of the Scriptures. Tertullian, according to the learned translator, appeals to Apostolic Tradition, to a rule of faith, not *originally* deduced from Scripture, but delivered by the Apostles orally to the Churches which they founded, and regularly transmitted from them to his own time. How, I would ask, is this appeal inconsistent with the principles of the Church of England, which declares *only* that holy Scripture

stances came to be altered, and there had been several breaks in the succession of Doctrine, and that too even in the Apostolical Churches, then there could be no arguing in the same precise way as before: only thus far they might argue in after times (upon a supposition that their faith could be proved to be the same as in the former ages), that since their Doctrine was still that very Doctrine which the Churches held while they were unanimous and had admitted no breaks, therefore it is such as was from the beginning in the Church of CHRIST. In this manner we can reason even at this day, and can thereby make Irenæus's or Tertullian's argument our own: provided we have first proved that the faith we contend for is the very same that obtained in the Churches of that age.—*On the HOLY TRINITY*, c. vii. *Works*, Vol. V. pp. 265—268.

It has been objected, that our sixth Article condemns the method of interpreting Scripture by antiquity, or at least supersedes it; because it says, "holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of faith, or necessary to salvation." The Article says nothing but what is perfectly right, and perfectly consistent with all we have been pleading for. We allow no doctrine as necessary which stands only on Fathers, or on Tradition, oral or written; we admit none for such, but what is contained in Scripture, and proved by Scripture, rightly interpreted. And we know of no way more safe in necessities to preserve the right interpretation, than to take the

contains all things necessary to salvation? Respecting the source from which the rule of faith was *originally* deduced, our Church is silent. The framers of our Articles meant not to deny that the rule of faith might, independently of the Scriptures, have been faithfully transmitted in the Apostolic Churches *down to Tertullian's time*. What they meant to assert was, that the rule so transmitted, contained no Article which was not either expressed in Scripture, or might be proved by it; and that the peculiar doctrines, in support of which the Roman Catholics appealed to Tradition, form no part of the Apostolic rule."—*The Ecclesiastical History of the Second and Third Centuries, illustrated from the Writings of Tertullian by the Bishop of Lincoln*. Second Edit. p. 299, note.

ancients along with us. We think it a good method to secure our rule of faith against impostures of all kinds; whether of enthusiasm, or false criticism, or conceited reason, or oral tradition, or the assuming dictates of an infallible chair. If we thus preserve the true sense of Scripture, and upon that sense build our faith, we then build upon Scripture only; for the sense of Scripture is Scripture. Suppose a man were to prove his legal title to an estate; he appeals to the laws: the true sense and meaning of the laws must be proved by the best rules of interpretation; but, after all, it is the law that gives the title, and that only. In like manner, after using all proper means to come at the sense of Scripture (which is Scripture), it is that, and that only, which we ground our faith upon, and prove our faith by. We allege not Fathers as grounds, or principles, or foundations of our faith, but as witnesses, and as interpreters, and faithful conveyers.

That the Church of England has a very particular regard to antiquity, may sufficiently appear from a Canon set forth in the same year when our Articles were first perfected and authorized by Act of Parliament, namely, in the year 1571. By that Canon it is provided, "that preachers," &c.¹ A wise regulation, formed with exquisite judgment, and worded with the exactest caution. The Canon does not order that they shall teach whatever had been taught by Fathers; no, that would have been setting up a new rule of faith; neither does it say that they shall teach whatsoever the Fathers had collected from Scripture; no, that would have been making them infallible interpreters, or infallible reasoners: the doctrine must be found first in Scripture: only, to be the more secure that we have found it there, the Fathers are to be called in, to be, as it were, constant checks upon the presumption or wantonness of private interpretation; but then again as to private interpretation, there is liberty enough allowed to it. Preachers are not forbidden to interpret this or that text, or hundreds of texts, differently from what the Fathers have done; provided still they keep within the analogy of faith, and presume not to raise any

¹ See ante, p. 5.

new doctrine: neither are they altogether restrained from teaching any thing new, provided it be offered as opinion only, or an inferior truth, and not pressed as necessary upon the people. For it was thought that there could be no necessary Article of faith or Doctrine now drawn from Scripture, but what the ancients had drawn out before from the same Scripture: to say otherwise, would imply that the ancients had failed universally in necessities, which is morally absurd.

From this account it may appear, that the Church of England is exactly in the same sentiments which I have been pleading for. And, indeed, if there be any Church now in the world, which truly reverences antiquity, and pays a proper regard to it, it is this Church. The Romanists talk of Antiquity, while we observe and follow it.—*On the HOLY TRINITY*, c. vii. pp. 442—446. Edit. 1734.

It has been sometimes pleaded, that the Scriptures are in themselves a perfect rule of faith: what need, therefore, can there be of Fathers, with respect to the fundamental Articles? To which we answer, that we produce not Fathers to superadd *new* doctrines to Scripture, but only to secure the *old*; not to *complete* the rule, but more strongly to assert and maintain both its *true* sense and *whole* sense. The more *perfect* the rule is, the more care and circumspection it demands, that we may preserve it entire, both as to *words* and *meaning*. For if either of them happens to be stolen away, or wrested from us, Scripture so maimed and castrated is no longer that *perfect rule* which CHRIST has ordained. It is much to be suspected, that many pretend a zeal for Scripture who mean nothing by it, but to have its fences taken down, that they may deal the more freely or rudely with it. They would exclude the *ancients* to make room for *themselves*, and throw a kind of slight upon the *received* interpretation only to advance their *own*. Such commonly has been the way, and therefore there is the less regard to be paid to magnificent words. They complain sometimes that interpreting Scripture by the ancients is debasing its majesty, and throwing CHRIST out of His

throne. But we think that CHRIST never sits more secure or easy in His throne, than when He has His most faithful guards about Him; and that none are so likely to strike at His authority, or to aim at dethroning Him, as they that would displace His old servants to make way for new ones, who may either obtrude themselves without call, or may be unfurnished for the employ, or not well affected to His person and government. But to speak out of figure, and to come closer to the business, the *perfection* of Scripture is a point allowed, and is no part of the question between us: the main question is, How we may be most secure of reaping the full benefits of that perfection, whether with the light of antiquity before us, or without it? We know how Faustus Socinus, under colour of extolling the perfection of Scripture, studied nothing so much as to blazon the perfection of his own parts and abilities, deserting the ancients, and trusting only to himself and his uncle Lælius. He presumed to set up his own fond conceits as the measure of all truth; which, in effect, was advancing a *new rule of faith*, and forcing Scripture to a compliance with it; preferring the roving of his own imagination before the wisdom of Heaven. It might be shown, on the other hand, that those who have least indulged their own fancies, but have adhered strictly to Antiquity in the prime things, have done most honour to the perfection of Scripture, and have kept the rule of faith entire; this therefore is the way, rather than the other.—*Ibid.* Works, Vol. V. pp. 282, 283.

You next endeavour to retort something upon me like to the Romanists, though entirely wide and foreign, and brought in most strangely. They have recourse, you say, to Tradition, you should have said to *oral* Tradition, which is quite another thing from *written* Tradition. And what harm is there in having recourse to *written* Tradition of Fathers for the sense of Scripture, more than in having recourse to a Dictionary for the sense of words, or to the practice of courts, resolutions of Judges, or books of Reports, for the sense of laws? All helps for the understanding of Scripture ought to be made use of; and recourse to the

Fathers is one, and a very considerable one.—*A second Defence of some Queries.* Qu. XXVII. *Works*, Vol. III. pp. 468, 469.

BRETT, PRIEST AND CONFESSOR.

B. 1667. D. 1743.

The Canon
De Concio-
natoribus.

IT is, I think, demonstrable that the rule of Doctrine and Religion, by which all Priests of the Church of England are to be guided in their sermons, writings, or controversies, is *the holy Scriptures*, not expounded according to their own conceits, or any modern glosses, but as interpreted and understood by the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops of the first five or six centuries. And, therefore, I, by declaring for that Doctrine and Religion of the whole Catholic Church, at the time of the Council of Nice (which was held in the beginning of the fourth century), do thereby keep to the rule which the Church of England has directed me to observe.—*Tradition necessary to explain and interpret the holy Scriptures.* § I. p. 5. Edit. 1718.

The rule
which it
lays down
is infallible.

I shall now proceed to show, that the safest method which a good Christian can take, is to adhere to the rule which the Church of England lays down as the standard of her Reformation, and, by prayers to God, and arguments with men, endeavour to prevail with all persons, of all persuasions, to be guided by that only infallible rule of true Religion: for the rule is certainly good and infallible, and only wants to be exactly followed. And I therefore conceive that those ought to be esteemed the best friends to the Church of England, who, as far as in them lies, resolve to follow this rule, howsoever they may be thereby obliged to dissent from some of her established usages. The rule, as I showed before, is, that “they hold and believe what is agreeable to the Doctrine, &c.¹” Now, all parties of those that call themselves Protestants, pretend to adhere to the former part of this rule, and say that *we are bound to hold and believe what is agreeable to the Doctrine of the Old and*

¹ See ante, p. 5.

New Testament, and they all pretend that they do so. But they have found so many several ways of interpreting those texts from whence they derive their Doctrine, that, notwithstanding all will tell you that they make the Bible their rule, yet they differ exceedingly about the Doctrine of it. What, then, shall an honest well-meaning man do in this case? which interpretation shall he follow? The Church-of-England man will tell you this is the natural sense of such a text, the Lutheran will expound it to another sense, the Calvinist to a third sense, the Antipædobaptist to a fourth, and so on. To this it is said by some, "Let every man search the Scriptures for himself with an honest *sincere* mind,¹ and God will enable him to understand them *rightly*, so far as it is necessary to salvation." But every one of these will tell you that he has so searched the Scriptures; that he has done it honestly and sincerely, that he has done it impartially, with a resolution to follow that which he should find to be the truth; that he has also prayed to God to enlighten his understanding, and to lead him into all truth, and particularly to direct him how to understand the Scriptures; and yet every one of these shall, as I said, give you a different sense of the same text, though they all follow the same rule in order to get a perfect understanding of it. Now it is certain that in this case all cannot give a right interpretation of it; one only can be right, and the others wrong, though they have the same rule; consequently this rule cannot be a sure guide, how plausible soever it may appear at first sight; it is plainly fallible, and appears to be so, in fact, which is the most evident demonstration. If it be said they cannot all be sincere in such a case as this, I answer, It is certain they may. St. Paul was well versed in the Scriptures before he became a Christian, and was very sincere in endeavouring rightly to understand them; neither wanted he learning or parts, for, after his conversion, he tells us of his learned education, and also takes notice of his sincerity, even whilst he was an enemy to the Church. And yet it is plain, that

¹ To those *Neoterics* who teach and *preach*, on the other hand, that if a man be but *sincere*, it matters little or nothing *what he believes*, the Editor

notwithstanding his great acquaintance with the Scriptures, and his sincerity, he did not rightly understand those Scriptures; therefore, searching the Scriptures with an honest sincere mind (for that, it is plain, Saul the persecutor, as well as Paul the apostle, did) is not sufficient to bring us to a right understanding of them, consequently this is not a rule to be relied on.—*Tradition necessary to explain and interpret the holy Scriptures*, § III. pp. 10—12.

Catholic
Tradition
the only
Guide to
the know-
ledge of
things
necessary
to salvation.

It remains that we inquire, What is the sufficient means by which we may come to the knowledge of things necessary to salvation? I answer, that I know of no other than the constant, universal Tradition of the Church, beginning from the time when God began to deliver His Oracles, and so proceeding downwards. I say, this Tradition is the only method we now have whereby we may come to the understanding of the Scriptures, and particularly the things therein contained which are necessary to salvation. For, first of all, it is by Tradition alone that we can or do understand any language; for the signification of words, together with the words themselves, are handed down from father to son, and from one age to another; and, as all other languages, so those in which the Scriptures were written, must be learned by Tradition. Whilst they were living languages, they were learned like others of the same kind, by *oral* Tradition; and now they are no longer spoken by any nation, they must be learned by *written* Tradition. For a man may pore out his eyes upon a Hebrew Bible, and a Greek Testament, and pray most

would address the following admirable remarks:—"If we consider how the mind of man is influenced by custom and education, and that his conscience and self-approbation will be according to his principles, then we shall see that sincerity, if admitted, would sanctify all the wickedness under heaven. St. Paul, as a zealous Jew, *verily thought* (that is, he was *sincerely of opinion*) that he 'ought to do many things contrary to the name of JESUS of Nazareth;' so he persecuted the Christians furiously, and 'breathed out threatenings and slaughter.' Now, as he had a good meaning in all he did, to what end was he converted, when his sincerity would have saved him in his former way? After his mind was better enlightened, he pronounced himself to have been the *greatest of sinners*, for what he had done in the *sincerity of his heart*."—Jones's (of Nayland) *Essay on the Church*, p. 51. Edit. 1800.

heartily to understand them, and yet shall never be the wiser, if he get not a master to instruct him, or have recourse to those authors who have expounded those languages into what he does understand. So that no man can understand even the words of Scripture at this time, without recourse to those that lived before him, that is, to Tradition, for the understanding those words. In the next place, no man can at this day tell what Books are sacred Scripture, and what are Apocryphal, but by Tradition. How do we know that the Books of Esdras, Tobit, Judith, &c. were not divinely inspired; and that the Books of Moses, Joshua, Judges, &c. were written by Divine inspiration, but from Tradition? We cannot learn it from the books themselves, for the Apocryphal Esdras, for instance, tells us that he was divinely inspired, which is more than the authors of the Books of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, or Kings, tell us in any of those Books. Again, it is by Tradition only that we know that the three first Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, were written by St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul; there is nothing in the Books themselves to certify us that they were written by those Apostles and Evangelists. And not to mention more of this kind, it is from Tradition alone that St. Mark and St. Luke, who were no Apostles, are yet received as inspired writers; and yet St. Barnabas (whose Epistle is, nevertheless, allowed to be genuine) is not allowed to have written by Divine inspiration, though he is expressly called an Apostle in Scripture. If, then, it is by Tradition that we must know the very language of the Scripture, and cannot otherwise understand one word of it; if it is by Tradition that we must know what is Scripture, and what is not so; if it is by Tradition only that we know who were the Penmen of many of the Books of Scripture; and if it is by Tradition that we judge that even an Epistle concerning our Religion, though written by an Apostle, yet was not by Divine inspiration,—shall we say, nevertheless, that Tradition is not necessary for the understanding of the Scriptures, and that all that is necessary to understand them, is to read them

with an honest upright heart, and to beg GOD's grace and direction that we may understand them right? By no means; for as GOD has made Tradition absolutely necessary for the conveying of the Scriptures to us, and for our understanding the very words and language in which the Scriptures were written, and also to enable us to judge what Books are sacred Scripture, and what are not so, so he has also appointed Tradition as the best and surest Guide to direct us how to understand the Scriptures, even in matters necessary to the salvation of all. For even the Scripture itself sends us to Tradition. "Remember the days of old," says Moses; "consider the years of many generations: ask thy father, and he will show thee; thy elders, and they will tell thee." (Deut. xxxii. 7.) So, also, Jeremiah exhorts in GOD's name, saying, "Thus saith the LORD, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way; and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls." (Jer. vi. 16.) So, also, Isaiah calls the people (Isa. viii. 20) not only *to the Law*, but *to the Testimony*, or the Tradition of their Fathers also. Likewise, in the New Testament, St. Paul says, "Now I praise you, Brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances (or *traditions*, for so it is in the original, *παράδοσεις*, as the margin of our Bibles has it) as I delivered them to you." (1 Cor. xi. 2.) And again he says, "Therefore, Brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our Epistle." (2 Thess. ii. 15.) And soon after he says, "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the traditions which he received of us." (2 Thess. iii. 6.) Here we see plain mention of St. Paul's *traditions*; consequently of *Apostolical traditions*, delivered by word of mouth, as well as by Epistles or in writing, and a condemnation of those who do not equally observe both. Thus the Scriptures themselves, both of the Old and New Testament, are so far from condemning true and primitive Tradition, that they plainly recommend it to us as the best and surest rule

by which we ought to be directed in our christian practice.
 —*Tradition necessary to explain and interpret the holy Scriptures*, § VII. pp. 30—33.

Since then the will of GOD being once revealed, is to be known afterwards by Tradition only, it behoves us to inquire how we may be satisfied that this Tradition does not deceive us: for it is a general opinion here that Tradition is very deceitful, and not at all to be relied upon; and I do readily grant that mere *oral* Tradition delivered from father to son, corroborated by no written evidence, is by no means to be relied upon for any long succession. And, therefore, we find that no nation or country can give any tolerably satisfactory account of the state and condition of their ancestors, before they come to have the use of letters amongst them, by which their manners, laws, customs, and acts, might be transmitted to posterity. But this is no argument against such a Tradition as is delivered or corroborated by written evidence, of such things, and in such manner, as we cannot think ourselves deceived by it. All our knowledge of laws, customs, and facts, which we are not ourselves eye-witnesses of, must be delivered to us by evidence, such as we have reason to believe; and we have no other way of coming to the knowledge of them. Now we could not be eye-witnesses of what happened before we were born; therefore, we must either say that we can come to the true knowledge of nothing which happened before we were born, which I think none but downright Sceptics will pretend to say; or else that we must believe such Tradition as deserves the name of a just and proper evidence; and I conceive that to be just and proper evidence, which we receive from those who could not be themselves deceived in what they relate, nor could have any design or purpose to deceive us in the relation, but on the contrary, must have exposed themselves to all their contemporaries, if they had given a wrong account of those matters. Therefore when an author of credit speaks of the customs or practice of the Church at a time when he lived, we have all the reason imaginable to believe him; for in that case it is certain he

How we may be satisfied that we are not deceived in a tradition. And that the traditions of the Church which are found elder than the Council of Nice, may be depended on, as derived from the Apostles.

could not be deceived himself, neither could he write what was false in such a case without exposing himself to all that were living at that time. Thus for instance, if any one at this time should tell the world, that it is the custom or practice of the Church of England to carry the Host or consecrated Eucharistical Bread in a solemn procession, as they do in the Church of Rome, he must expose himself as a shameless liar, and could never be esteemed an author of any credit, because every man now living in England would know the thing to be false. Nay, if he should say that this was the practice in this realm an hundred and fifty years ago, or any time since the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, every Englishman would know it to be false, though there is no man now living that can remember what was done in her reign. And the like may be said with regard to any other public part of Divine worship. No man can impose upon the world so far, as to make them believe that any thing is a public practice, which he himself does not know, or see to be so. And though a man might possibly put upon a stranger, who may be supposed ignorant of the customs of the people, to whom he is a stranger; yet he that had the least value for his own reputation, would not dare to do this to a stranger living among the people of whose customs he pretends to give him an account, especially, if by that account he hopes to obtain a favour from that stranger, and may have just apprehensions of suffering through the displeasure of that stranger, if he should go about to deceive him. We may therefore be satisfied that St. Barnabas, for instance, would not have told the Jews that God had appointed us to keep holy the eighth day, or first day of the week, in memory of CHRIST's resurrection, and abolished the observation of the Sabbath day, if the Apostles had not taught this as the will of God: for he could not be deceived in this matter himself, being a companion of the Apostles, and well acquainted with the Doctrine which they taught. Neither could he, if he would, put a deceit in this case upon any others, because all the Christians then living could have refuted him if he had uttered a falsehood in this particular. Therefore,

though we do not place his Epistle among the inspired writings, yet we cannot question his evidence as to this matter. And the same may be said of Justin Martyr; if he had told the Emperors any falsehood with relation to the practice of the Christians, it was impossible but they must easily have discovered it, not a Christian then living but must have known it to be a falsehood, if it had been so; consequently he would not only have exposed himself as a shameless liar, but would likewise have made himself liable to the just displeasure of the Emperors, if he had not spoke the truth: nay, if any thing that he told the Emperors had been a new practice, and such as had not been the constant practice of the Christian Church from the beginning, he durst not have pleaded in behalf of such a practice as a Christian institution, for which so many Christians then living could have convicted him of falsehood, it being but forty years from the death of the Apostles when he wrote, and many of the Apostles' disciples who learned the Christian institutions immediately from them, being then alive. Justin then could not be deceived himself with regard to the Christian institutions, since he had opportunity of informing himself from the immediate disciples of the Apostles; and he durst not pretend to impose upon the Emperors, nor could have any interest either to write a false relation to them, or to put a cheat upon those that should come after. Therefore what we find to have been delivered as a custom of the Church, by St. Barnabas, or St. Justin, or any writers contemporary to them, that we firmly believe to have been of Apostolical institution. And we may say the same also of those that followed them for one hundred and fifty years after the Apostles, such as Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Origen, St. Cyprian, and their contemporaries, who could no more be put upon, and made to believe that any thing was an Apostolical institution, and publicly practised by the whole Church, than any man of sense and learning could now be put upon, and made to believe that such a thing (though really it was not so) was established here at the Reformation under Queen Elizabeth, and had continued to be the prac-

tice of the English Church ever since. And the same may be said if we add fifty or sixty years more to the account, which brings us down to the time of the Council of Nice. A Christian Synod could no more be deceived at that time in declaring the doctrine and practice taught and practised by the Apostles, than a bench of English Judges could be deceived in any law or custom which should be pretended to have been begun here in the reign of King Henry VII. And, therefore, where we have the declaration of that Council, or of any authors contemporary with it, or with any members of it, I conceive we may very reasonably depend upon their testimony for the truth of an Apostolical tradition. The testimony of the Church, therefore, is thus far at least to be esteemed a certain evidence of Divine or Apostolical institutions, and hitherto we may safely follow it without danger of being led into error by so doing; and that which may confirm us that hitherto the Church had not been deceived with regard to Apostolical institutions and practices is, her unanimity in those matters. Whatever was held as derived from Apostolic authority by one Church, was esteemed as such also by all other Churches, which could not have been if there had been a failure in the tradition; for error is various, and all Churches from east to west, from north to south, from one end of the world to another, could never have agreed in an erroneous tradition. Therefore where we find all Churches agreed in the same doctrines and forms of worship, and we are not able to trace the beginning of them, we may safely conclude that they are derived to us from the Apostles: for this is the rule laid down by St. Austin on this occasion: "whatsoever the universal Church holdeth, and which was not instituted by any Council, but has been always observed, that we most rightly conclude to have been a tradition derived from Apostolical authority." And in another place he says, "many things which are not to be found in their writings," (that is in the writings of the Apostles,) "nor in the Councils of later ages, yet because they are observed by the whole Church, are believed not to have been delivered or recommended by any authority but of them."

Again, says he, "there are many things which the Universal Church holds, and which for this reason are rightly believed to be commanded by the Apostles, although they are not found written." But it is to be observed, that it is only such traditions as have been held by the Universal Church in all ages and all places, such as we can trace up to the Apostolical age, and have the evidence of some of the Fathers, who living either in the Apostolical times, or so near to them that they could not but distinguish between Apostolical traditions and later institutions, have given their testimony concerning. And therefore we justly reject the doctrine of purgatory, invocation of Saints, worship of relics and images, and other corrupt traditions of the Church of Rome, because we cannot find any evidence for their universality and antiquity. We can trace the original of all of them, and find them many years later than the times of the Apostles: but on the contrary we find the doctrines and customs of the ages nearest to the Apostles to be directly opposite to these modern traditions. It is not then every tradition that lays an obligation upon Christians, but only such traditions as we have good evidence to believe to have been derived from the Apostles, that is, the testimony of those who lived either in the Apostles' age, or so near to it that they could not easily be imposed upon in this case, and made to believe that to be of Apostolical tradition which really was not so; that is to say, about the time of the Council of Nice, about two hundred years after the Apostolical age. And we may also believe the testimony of those who lived in the century following that Council, since in that time they could not be deceived in the tradition of what was acknowledged at the time of that Council to be Apostolical. But there is no better rule for the judging concerning the authority of Tradition, than that which is given by Vincentius Lirinensis in the beginning of his Commentary.—*Tradition necessary to explain and interpret the holy Scriptures*, § XI. pp. 35—42.

I have already showed that St. Paul requires us to "stand fast, and hold the traditions which he delivered," The Form of sound words which

St. Paul committed to Timothy, and was also committed to other Apostolical Bishops, was something to be delivered down to succeeding ages by Tradition.

whether by word or epistle." Therefore if it be proved to be a tradition of the Apostles, though it be not expressly delivered in their writings, it obliges us by this precept of St. Paul to hold it. And the same Apostle writing to Timothy, and in him to all the Bishops, says: "Keep that which is committed to thy trust." (1 Tim. vi. 20.) Now, what was it which he had committed to his Trust? He himself explains it in his next Epistle, where he says, "Hold fast the Form of sound words which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in CHRIST JESUS. That good thing (that is, that Form of sound words) which was committed to thee, keep by the HOLY GHOST which dwelleth in us." (2 Tim. i. 13, 14.) But what was that Form of sound words? Was it any thing contained in writing? No, the text plainly shows the contrary, for he expressly tells him that it was what *he had heard*, what had been delivered to him by word of mouth. It could not be the Scriptures of the New Testament, for they were not all yet written, nor were completed and collected into a volume till many years after. But it was the sum and substance of Christian Religion which St. Paul had taught Timothy by oral instructions, and required him carefully to preserve and retain in his memory, and teach them to others, that they also might understand all the duties of Christianity. (2 Tim. ii. 2.) Thus it is evident from the Scriptures themselves that the whole of Christianity was at first delivered to the Bishops succeeding the Apostles by oral Tradition, and they were also commanded to keep it, and delivered it to their Successors in the same manner. Nor is it anywhere said in the Scripture by St. Paul, or any other of the Apostles, that they would either jointly or separately write down all that they had taught, as necessary to salvation, or make such a complete Canon of them, as that nothing should be necessary to salvation but what should be found in those writings; yet it is most certain that they taught them all things necessary to salvation; for so St. Paul expressly tells the elders of Ephesus, saying, "I kept back nothing that was profitable to you, but have showed you, and have taught you publicly, and from house

to house." (Acts xx. 20.) And yet it is certain that many Books of the New Testament were written after this, after St. Paul had taught them whatever was requisite for them to know. And there is no question but St. Paul did the same in all other Churches which he settled; he taught them every thing necessary to salvation by preaching, or by word of mouth, and they had not the Scriptures of the New Testament left with them to guide and instruct them. And the same may be said with regard to all the other Apostles; they preached the Gospel, and taught those whom they converted to Christianity, all that they were to believe and do, before any of them wrote any thing to direct them in those matters: so that the first Christians in all parts of the world received their whole Religion by Tradition; and these traditions were in a more especial manner (as appears from what St. Paul says to Timothy just before cited) left with the Bishops or Heads of the several Churches, and they were particularly commanded to keep and observe them, and commit the same to faithful men from age to age after them, that they might never be forgotten. Therefore where we have a certain indubitable evidence of Apostolical Tradition, we are no less obliged to observe and keep it than if we found it clearly revealed to us in the holy Scriptures. For even the Scriptures themselves refer us to these traditions, and require us to observe them. And the Scriptures were not written to abolish what had been before delivered by word of mouth, but to *confirm and preserve it*. Neither did the Apostles, either jointly or separately, collect the Scriptures of the New Testament into one volume, and leave them with any Church as the rule of their faith and practice, but this was done by the Bishops and their Successors after their death. It is then a plain Apostolical precept contained in St. Paul's Epistle to Timothy, that the Form of sound words, the good thing committed to his trust, and to the trust of the other Bishops ordained by the Apostles and their Successors, should be the rule of our faith and practice; but there is no such precept concerning the Books of the New Testament, none of the Apostles have commanded us to make

them our rule; and indeed how could they, since the Canon of Scripture was not completed till the death of St. John, the longest liver of all of them? and it does not appear that ever he saw all the Books of the Scripture, or established them as the rule of faith. Nor does this derogate from the authority of the New Testament; for as the several Books of it were written by the Apostles, or Apostolical men Divinely inspired, it is certain that whatever we find therein is infallibly true, and the Word of God, which we are strictly bound to believe and obey, and are likewise obliged to disbelieve and disobey whatever is contrary to it. But though we are bound to believe and obey the doctrines of the New Testament, it does not therefore follow that *all* the duties of Christianity are there *clearly* revealed. For whatever doctrine we find in any one Book of the New Testament, we are bound to believe and obey it; but nobody will therefore say that any one Book of the New Testament contains *all* that we are to believe and obey. Neither is there any text in Scripture which tells us that the whole Scripture taken altogether *clearly* delivers to us *all* parts of our duty, or whatever we are bound to believe and practise.—*Tradition necessary to explain and interpret the holy Scriptures*, § XX. pp. 77—80.

We receive
both Scrip-
ture and
Tradition
on the
testimony of
Antiquity,
Universal-
ity, and
Consent.

The sum of the matter is this: Whatever appears to be the will of CHRIST, and to have been taught by Himself or His Apostles, we are obliged to believe and practise according thereto. Whatever is contained in the New Testament, plainly appears to be the will of CHRIST, and to have been taught by Himself and His Apostles. Therefore we are obliged to believe and practise according to what we find in the New Testament. But forasmuch as the Scriptures of the New Testament do testify that the Christian Religion was at first delivered by Tradition, and that we are as much obliged to observe what we find to have been so delivered, as what we find to have been written by the Apostles, and these Scriptures do nowhere teach that all things taught by our SAVIOUR or His Apostles as necessary to salvation are there collected and recorded, it evidently follows that where

we have certain and undoubted testimony of any thing's being delivered by the Apostles as necessary to be practised, we are as much obliged to practise accordingly as if we were required to do so by any text of Scripture. And whatever has *Antiquity, Universality, and Consent*, has such certain and undoubted testimony: for we have no other external evidence for the Scriptures themselves, but only that they have been universally received by the Church as such *in all times, and at all places, and by all the faithful*.—*Tradition necessary to explain and interpret the holy Scriptures*, § XX. pp. 80, 81.

And as the Christian Religion was at first taught by Tradition, before any Book of the New Testament was written, so it has been ever since, and still is taught in the same manner; persons are first instructed in the principles of Christianity, before the Scriptures are put into their hands. Indeed I have frequently known it supposed that an infidel may by chance meet with a Bible, and read it diligently and carefully, and so become a convert to the Christian Religion, without receiving instruction from any person living, or conversation with any Christian: but I never could learn that any such thing happened in fact. All that have ever embraced the Christian Religion, have either been born and educated in a Christian country, where they have been taught the doctrines of Christianity from their infancy, and before they were capable of reading or understanding the Bible; or else have been converted to Christianity by the preaching or instruction of Christians. And having been so educated in, or converted to the Christian Religion, they have then read the Scriptures; and if they had been before rightly grounded, have understood them in all things necessary to their great comfort and confirmation. But that any one ever did learn the whole Doctrine of Christianity, and arrive but so much as to a clear speculative knowledge of the faith and worship of the Church of CHRIST, by only reading the Scriptures and without the instruction of those who have before him been taught that faith and worship, I believe there never

As Christianity was at first taught by Tradition, so it has continued to be taught ever since: and every Christian has first been so instructed.

Holy Scrip-
ture the
test of Doc-
trine.

was, nor ever will be an instance. As Christianity was taught at first by the preaching of the Apostles and others commissioned by them for that purpose, and was also propagated in private families (2 Tim. i. 5, compared with 2 Tim. iii. 15,) by the instructions which parents gave to their children, or by private (Acts xviii. 26,) teaching of other persons, both men and women, so it has still continued to be taught and propagated in the same manner, that is, by Tradition. For we are still taught the doctrines of Christianity, whether of faith or worship, by the Bishops and Presbyters of the Church, as Successors to the Apostles and their Assistants, in public; and by our parents, guardians, schoolmasters and mistresses, or other persons, in private. And the Scriptures were written, not to set aside or make void this traditional method of instruction, but to confirm and establish it, and to be a *guide or rule* to those that teach others, that they may deliver nothing but what they find agreeable to the will of God there revealed, and also as a test by which those that are taught may examine the doctrines they have learned, and see if they be agreeable to the things contained in the Scriptures. But the Scriptures were not intended to teach us the first rudiments of Christianity (though even those rudiments are to be tried by the Scriptures); for till we have learned them, we shall make but a very slow progress in learning from the Scriptures alone what is necessary to salvation, if we can so learn it at all. I am persuaded that if a man who had never been taught any thing of Christianity, should read the Scriptures never so carefully and diligently, if he should be asked the question which Philip put to the Eunuch, (Acts viii. 30, 31,) "Understandest thou what thou readest?" he would find it necessary to make the same answer, "How can I, except some man should guide me?" That which appears easy and plain to those who have been already taught the principles of the Christian Religion, would not easily be found out by those who knew nothing of those principles before they came to read the Scriptures. Thus, for instance, I have already showed that a man cannot find out by the Scriptures alone that the first day

of the week, or the LORD's Day, is the day whereon Christians ought to assemble and meet together to worship God; and yet the Scriptures are sufficient to satisfy any one after he has been taught this doctrine, that to do this is agreeable to the will of God; so on the other hand, a man that knows nothing of Christianity, but as he has learned it from the Scriptures, may think some things absolutely necessary for a Christian, which no one educated in that Religion ever thought to be so. Thus for instance, (John xiii. 2, &c.) there seems to be a positive command in the New Testament that when we receive the Eucharist, or immediately after, we should wash one another's feet: for we read, "Supper being ended," or as Dr. Hammond says it ought to be rendered, "during the time of supper, JESUS riseth from supper, and layeth aside His garments, and took a towel and girdeth Himself: after that He poureth water into a bason, and began to wash the Disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith He was girded: so after He had washed their feet, and had taken His garments, and was sat down again, He said unto them, Know ye what I have done to you? Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also OUGHT to wash one another's feet: for I have given you an example, that YE SHOULD DO AS I HAVE DONE TO YOU." Now here is a very positive command given at the time He gave the Holy Eucharist; and no intimation given that He did not intend it to be literally understood. How can a man that is guided only by the Scriptures, without any regard to the practice and Tradition of the Church, distinguish between this and the precept for celebrating the holy Eucharist? Why, may he say, should one be observed and not the other? Do the words, *Do this in remembrance of Me*, imply a stronger precept than, *Ye ought to wash one another's feet; I have given you an example that ye should do what I have done to you?* Nay, may such an one say, why should not this be a Sacrament as well as the other? for here are all the parts of a Sacrament. Here is an outward and visible sign, *the washing*

If no regard be had to Tradition, it might be easy to prove it necessary to wash one another's feet.

the feet with water. Here is also the inward and spiritual grace, *the cleansing the persons whose feet are washed from the sins contracted after Baptism:* for so our SAVIOUR tells Peter, saying, (John xiii. 10,) "He that has been washed" (so it is in the original), that is, he that has been baptized, "needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit." It appears also to be a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof; our SAVIOUR saying expressly, when Peter would have hindered Him from washing his feet, "If I wash thee not thou hast no part in Me." This is a very plain and literal construction of this passage; and if we were to have only the Scripture to guide us, I cannot see how we could justify ourselves in not observing this seeming positive precept or institution. But forasmuch as we have no Tradition that this was ever practised by the Apostles, or their Successors, at any time, or in any place, (excepting that it is said that the Pope and some Princes do, in testimony of their humility, wash the feet of some poor persons on Maundy Thursday) we justly conclude that this passage is not to be literally interpreted, and that the Apostles themselves, whom the HOLY GHOST led into all truth, did not understand it in a literal sense; but that the whole design of our SAVIOUR in what He here did and commanded, was to teach us that we should be ready at all times to do the meanest offices for one another, as there should be occasion for it, and not think it below us to do a thing as mean as the washing the feet of our own servants, if there be a necessity for it. But we could not so understand it, if the Apostles and primitive Church had given us their testimony that it was to be understood in a literal sense, and had accordingly washed the feet of all communicants when they celebrated the Eucharist. But as we do not find that they ever did any such thing, we from thence gather that our SAVIOUR required no such thing of us. However, I do not conceive how a man that has no regard for Tradition, can be satisfied that this is the true meaning of this place of Scripture, nor what other reason he can give why it should not be literally understood; and yet I do not remember to have read or heard of

any sect of Christians, or of any single person, that ever taught or practised the necessity of washing one another's feet. For indeed how much soever some men decry Tradition, *they cannot totally discard it*, and are forced to have recourse to it upon some occasions.—*Tradition necessary to explain and interpret the holy Scriptures*, § XXII. pp. 86—91.

It is necessary for the right understanding our duty as Christians, that we join together Scripture and Tradition. And as we cannot receive any tradition which is contrary to Scripture, so neither can we receive any interpretation of Scripture which is contrary to truly primitive and universal Tradition, because it is by such Tradition that we are assured that the Books we have received as holy Scripture are indeed the Word of God. And therefore we justly reject those traditions which the Church of Rome would impose upon us: such as the denial of the cup to the laity, worshipping of images, relics, saints, &c. which are directly contrary to positive texts of Scripture, which cannot, with any reasonable interpretation, be reconciled to them. But then we also at the same time deny (and are able to prove it) that these are primitive and universal. We can trace the original of them, and find them to fall much short of the Apostolical age, or the time of the Council of Nice, which was two hundred years later. But the case is very different with regard to those traditions we plead for, which have been received and practised in all ages, in all places, and by all the faithful, down to the time of John Calvin and his contemporaries, who were the first that took upon them to understand the Scriptures, and the practice of the Apostles, better than those who lived in the Apostolical times, or immediately after them. As if those who lived not till fourteen or fifteen hundred years after the Canon of Scripture was completed, knew the sense and meaning of it better than those who collected that Canon, and transmitted it to us. And whereas they say, that some traditions having been imposed contrary to the Word of God, for that reason all traditions ought to be rejected, we

It is necessary for our right understanding our duty as Christians, that we join together Scripture and Tradition.

say this is a wrong way of arguing. For at this rate we might reject even the Scriptures themselves. For some Books have been imposed upon us as Scripture, which we are satisfied are Apocryphal; must we for that reason reject all Scripture? Nobody will say so; they will say, we ought therefore carefully to examine and inquire what Books really are Scripture and what are not. So we say; forasmuch as some false traditions have been imposed, we are not therefore to reject all traditions, but to try and examine what traditions are truly primitive and what are not so. And we deny that there are any traditions truly primitive, that have been universally received by the Catholic Church at the time of the Council of Nice, or any time before it, or for a considerable time after, which are not very agreeable to the Word of God, as contained in the holy Scriptures; for which reason we think, that such traditions ought to be highly regarded; that Calvin, nor any of his contemporaries, or any particular Church whatsoever, had authority to discard or reject such traditions; and that where we find them to have been so discarded, as it is certain many of them have been within about two hundred years past, it is our duty, though at the utmost hazard, to restore them as far as we are able. And of this sort I reckon all traditions not purely ceremonial or circumstantial, which we can trace up to the Council of Nice, and there or before find them to have been received and practised, *in all times, at all places, and by all the faithful*, according to the golden rule of Vincentius Lirinensis. For such matters as we cannot find the beginning of, or show a time wherein they were not received (which effectually excludes all the corrupt traditions of the Church of Rome, and of every other corrupted Church), we do verily believe to have been Apostolical; according to that excellent rule of St. Augustine, "Whatsoever the Universal Church holdeth, and which was not instituted by any Council, but has been always observed, that we most rightly conclude to have been a tradition derived from Apostolical authority." And we may defy all our adversaries to produce any such tradition which is not agreeable to the Scriptures. For I cannot persuade myself

that the first Bishops and Fathers who succeeded the Apostles, men of extraordinary piety and the greatest integrity, to whom also GOD vouchsafed frequent manifestations of His SPIRIT and extraordinary gifts, and who highly revered the Apostles, and had nothing more at heart than to follow their example in all things, that these men, through any vain superstition, should leave the path that had been trodden by the Apostles, to find out new ways for themselves. They must be much more credulous than I who can believe this. Therefore I shall, as far as I am able, stick to the rule of the Church of England, laid down at the beginning of this Discourse, and *take care that I never teach, &c.*¹ I shall observe the directions before mentioned, given to the Bishops and others in the year 1582, that *if any of our adversaries, &c.*² And I shall endeavour, as far as lies in me, to persuade the Governors of the Church of England to make good the declaration of this Church, in her thirtieth Canon of 1603, *that her purpose was not to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, &c.*³ Now it is very certain that these, and all other Churches of that Communion, have not fallen either “from themselves in their ancient integrity, or from the Apostolical Churches, which were their first founders,” in the use of Chrism, at Confirmation, in mixing water with the sacramental wine, in the oblation of the bread and wine in the Eucharist as a proper sacrifice, in the unction of the sick, and in praying for the faithful departed. It is confessed these Churches of Italy, France, &c. have corrupted and abused these institutions, or some of them at least; but the Church of England has not thought fit to reform the abuses, but has forsaken and rejected the things themselves. This is a matter of fact obvious to all, and therefore the Church of England has indeed obliged herself to restore these and other primitive practices observed by those Churches before they fell from their integrity: otherwise she stands self-condemned by her own declaration.—*Tradition necessary to explain and interpret the holy Scriptures, § XXV. pp. 101—106.*

¹ See ante, p. 5.² See ante, p. 6.³ See ante, p. 7.

Of the *Deposit* committed by St. Paul to St. Timothy.

These words of St. Paul (1 Tim. vi. 20) are a certain evidence that he committed a *Depositum* containing a *Form of sound words* to the trust of Timothy; consequently, the same was committed to all Bishops, for Timothy was obliged to commit the same to such “faithful men” as were appointed to “teach others.” This *Depositum*, this *good Thing*, could not be the holy Scriptures of the New Testament, for the Canon of the New Testament was not yet completed, several Books of that sacred Volume being written after the Epistles to Timothy; besides, the word *ὑποτύπωσις*, which we render *Form*, signifies an *Exemplar*, or *Impression*, something which was to remain constantly fixed in his mind or memory; which must imply a short summary of what was necessary to be believed and practised. Now we find no such summary of faith and practice in the New Testament; but we have a summary of faith drawn up in our Creed, which we call Apostolical, the form of which is not given us in Scripture, only we may, by comparing the Articles therein contained with the Scriptures of the New Testament, find that they are all agreeable to that sacred Book. We may find every Article confirmed by one or more texts, to be met with in several places; but there is no one chapter, or any one Book of the New Testament, that contains what will confirm every Article of the Creed; neither is there any passage in the whole Scripture that tells us these Articles are necessarily to be believed, or so much as intimates that the Creed contains all that is necessary to be believed. For though every Article in the Creed being to be proved by Scripture, is therefore necessary to be believed when it is known that it is therein contained, yet it does not therefore follow that we are bound to know and believe it in order to be saved; for there are many things in the Scripture which are not necessary to be known, and consequently not necessary to be believed in order to salvation; yet if we do know them, it is also necessary to believe them, because they are there. Thus, for instance, it is not necessary a man should know that St. Paul went from Athens to Corinth, or that Gallio was at that time the deputy of Achaia, with an hundred things of the like nature,

which are written in the Scripture. He may be saved without knowing such things, and consequently without believing them; for we can't be said to believe what we know nothing of; but if he finds these things in the Scripture, and so knows them, it is also necessary that he believe them to be true, otherwise he questions the veracity of the HOLY SPIRIT. However, it is not necessary, even when we do know such things as these, that we should fix them in our minds and memories. That *good Thing*, therefore, committed to the trust of Timothy, and other Apostolical Bishops and their Successors, being a *Form or Exemplar of sound words impressed or fixed in memory*, must be something which, though agreeable with the Scriptures, yet is not there written in the same manner as it was delivered, and ordered to be kept; and therefore we justly esteem the Creed, which summarily contains what is necessary to be known and believed by every Christian to be a part of this *Depositum*, of this *Form of sound words*, committed to Timothy and all Apostolical Bishops, to be by them carefully preserved and handed down to their Successors. And accordingly we find that every Church, every Bishop, had such a Creed, or summary Form of the Articles of faith, which every Christian was bound to know and believe in order to his salvation. Many of which Forms are still extant, which though different in words and some particular expressions from each other, as whatever is handed down by Tradition to different nations and in different languages will be, yet all agree in the same sense. And therefore when the Bishops of the several parts of the world met together in the great Council of Nice, we find all of them (being three hundred and eighteen in number) agreeing to the Form there drawn up, and testifying that it was the faith which they had received and professed from the foundation of their several Churches to that time. Now I conceive it to have been impossible that they could all have been so unanimous in their opinion and testimony, without such a Form delivered to them by the Apostles or Apostolical Bishops, that were the founders of their several Churches. For had every Bishop or Church drawn up a

Creed for itself, and taken it from the Scriptures according to their own private sense, without any regard to Tradition, they could not all have agreed in so short a summary, and we must have had some Creeds as long and as particular as some of our modern Confessions of faith, and have seen as little agreement betwixt them. As, therefore, it is certain from the Scriptures that a *Form of sound words* was delivered to every Apostolical Bishop, and committed to his trust with a strict charge to keep it pure and inviolable; and as this Form was delivered before many Books of the New Testament were written, consequently before that part of the Canon of holy Scripture was completed, we are thereby assured that it could not be the Books of the New Testament. And as we are assured by the testimony of the whole Church, that there was a Creed or Summary of the Articles of faith preserved in every Church, which all Christians were bound to know and believe in order to salvation; which Creeds, although they differ from one another in words, yet all agree in the same sense; we may from hence be fully satisfied that this Creed was a part of the *Form of sound words* which was delivered to the Apostolical Churches, and particularly to the Bishops of those Churches, by the Apostles themselves. Consequently, those Articles of faith wherein all Creeds are agreeable to each other in sense (though it may be not exactly in words), are necessary to be known and believed by all Christians. And whereas when the Bishops from all parts of the Christian world met at the Council of Nice, they all unanimously attested the Creed there drawn up, to be agreeable to the faith or Creed which they had all received and held from the first foundation of their Churches to that time; and whereas the same Creed, a little enlarged and explained as to its last Article, was again in like manner attested and subscribed to in the next General Council of Constantinople, and has ever since been received and believed by all orthodox Christians, we from thence justly conclude, that this Creed, as to what concerns the necessary Articles of faith, which all are obliged to know and believe, is perfectly agreeable to that Creed, or *Form of sound words*, committed by the

Apostles to the trust of the Apostolical Bishops and their Successors. And therefore we may very justly reject all Articles put into Creeds, which are not conformable to the Articles of this Creed, and for that as well as other reasons, cannot subscribe to the modern Popish Articles that have been added to the Creed by Pope Pius IV.—*Tradition necessary to explain and interpret the holy Scriptures*, § XXVIII. pp. 113—117.¹

POTTER, ARCHBISHOP.

B. 1674. D. 1747.

To begin with faith, the foundation of all other Christian duties. You cannot be ignorant what attempts have lately been made, and are still daily further advancing, to destroy some of the principal doctrines, not of ours only, but of the Catholic Church in all ages; and I wish I could not say, to weaken and undermine all the rest: “these things have not been done in a corner.”

Modern
liberality
exposed and
condemned.

Great industry hath been used, and that with too much success, to revive the Arian and Semi-arian heresies; and with the professors thereof to unite almost all other sects of Christians, however they may differ from one another as to opinion, in the same visible Communion. So that instead of rejecting those, who deprave the Christian faith, as St. Paul commands; or, in obedience to St. John, of refusing even to “receive them into our houses,” or to “bid them God speed;” should this design prevail, we must pray with them, and partake with them of the LORD’S Table, and associate together in all other parts of religious worship; and those alone will be reputed schismatics, who separate themselves from the Communion of heretics.

Some have so far proceeded in this scheme of general comprehension, or rather confusion, as to assert, that all sorts of error, except those which immediately relate to practice, are innocent and unblamable. With these men

¹ The preceding extracts comprise nearly all that is important in Dr. Brett’s scarce and celebrated tract on Tradition.

one may, perhaps, deserve the name of an heretic, who outwardly professeth something he inwardly disbelieves, and in that sense condemns himself: but in any other case, besides this of acting directly against the dictates of conscience, under which it is on all hands confessed to be a fault to defend the truth itself, they plainly intimate, that there is no harm in maintaining even the Doctrine of Mahomet, or any other, though ever so opposite to the Christian Revelation. We must not, therefore, wonder to hear it affirmed, that in order to be justified before God, there is no need of any thing more, than to act agreeably to our present inward persuasion, or, in other terms, with sincerity;¹ or, that equal degrees of this quality will in all cases (for I find no exception made) entitle men to equal degrees of Divine favour: whence it follows, that they who denied, or even crucified our SAVIOUR, provided they did it without remorse or hesitation, might deserve an equal reward with those, who are martyrs for Him.

We have been accustomed, and this agreeably to the judgment of all other Churches, and the most evident principles both of Natural and Revealed Religion, to think it the duty of Christian princes to maintain God's true Religion and virtue; and the Church, our Mother, hath taught us in the Communion office to pray, that all in authority under them may do the same. Now, if by God's true Religion nothing be meant, but that moral virtue,

¹ "Nearly related to the sufficiency of moral virtue, is the principle of *sincerity*, which was set up in the last age, as sufficient of itself to justify man in the sight of God, independent of the authority and benefits of His Church: so that if a man be not a *hypocrite*, it matters not what Religion he is of. If sincerity, *as such*, independent of any particular way of worship, can recommend man to the favour of God, then there can be no difference as to merit between a sincere martyr, and a sincere persecutor: and he that burns a Christian, if he be but in earnest, hath the same title to God's favour, as he that is burnt for believing in JESUS CHRIST. This position (in the sense of it) absurd and monstrous as it must appear, was the support of a controversy in this kingdom, *in which a Bishop led the way*, and was followed and applauded by all the libertines and loose thinkers of the nation, who foresaw that the argument would end in the dissolution of the Church as a Society: and therefore they made him a thousand compliments."—JONES, *On the Church*, pp. 49—51.

from which it is plainly distinguished in this place, then our new masters may still perhaps allow the magistrate to execute this part of his office; but, if GOD's true Religion signifies that, which it always hath signified among Christians, the worship of One True GOD, as opposed to that of idols and false gods, or the way of worship prescribed in the holy Scripture, in opposition to Heathenish, and other superstitions; or, if GOD's true Religion be understood to imply the belief of Three Persons in one Godhead, of the Incarnation, sufferings, and satisfaction of CHRIST, of the Resurrection of the Body, or of any other doctrine ever so plainly revealed by GOD; then it is openly declared, that for Christian magistrates to discourage false Religion, even in the least degree, or to favour and encourage that which is true, is to do something highly inconsistent both with the nature and ends of their own authority, and with the kingdom of CHRIST.

This may seem strange doctrine in a Christian country: but, since the faith was for several ages maintained without the favour or protection of the civil magistrate, they, who advance these and the like novel opinions, may perhaps be thought more excusable, if they endeavour to recompense for the loss of these temporal advantages by their hearty concern and just zeal for that spiritual power, which our LORD hath left in His Church. But, instead of this, these men describe the Church, rather as a number of persons disunited from, and independent on one another, than as an orderly society under lawful governors of Divine, or necessary appointment; and thus root up, as far as in them lieth, the very foundation of all Ecclesiastical authority at once. It might easily be shown, how by the schemes lately published, every branch of this authority hath been very much weakened and impaired; or, rather, totally subverted and destroyed: but I shall confine myself to the subject, of which I have been chiefly speaking, viz. the Christian faith; in things relating to which, it hath been thought, not only highly inconvenient, but absurd and impracticable for the Church to have any sort of authority whatsoever. Our own Church, indeed, in her twentieth Article hath expressly

declared, that *the Church hath authority in controversies of faith*; and therefore some of them, who do not approve this passage, have taken great pains to persuade the world, that it was not originally in the Article, but inserted there by some, who affected more power than of right belonged to them:¹ but this attempt not succeeding according to their desires, the rest always speak of it with such reservations and evasions, as plainly show they heartily wish it were quite expunged. One of the chief causes of their complaint, is the obliging men to declare their assent to human decisions, as they are called; that is, to Articles of faith, or doctrines, which however clearly deduced from the holy Scriptures, are not found there in express words. For, when “unlearned and unstable” men, to use the words of St. Peter, “wrested the Scriptures to their own destruction,” it was always customary, even from the most primitive ages, for the Church, in order to prevent the spreading of such infections, to require her members, especially such of

¹ “The twentieth Article, ‘On the Authority of the Church,’ is chiefly remarkable, because it has given rise to a charge of interpolation. In its present form it consists of two parts, the first asserting a power in the Church to decree rites and ceremonies, and to judge in matters of faith; the second limiting this power, and submitting it to the rule of Scripture: but it has been disputed whether the first clause was originally a part of the Article as drawn up by the reformers of Elizabeth. That the clause is not to be found in the corresponding Article of Edward, proves nothing against its genuineness: the strongest argument for its interpolation is its omission in the two manuscripts of the Articles preserved in the library of Corpus Christi College, in the University of Cambridge. But, that these manuscripts are originals, is a point which remains to be proved; and it is certain that the questionable clause occurs in the earliest printed edition of the Articles. The records of the Convocation being destroyed, it is impossible now to appeal to an evidence which would be conclusive; but, in the time of Archbishop Laud, these records were in existence, and when examined by him the clause was found; and they were afterwards inspected by Heylin, who confirms the testimony of Laud. Fuller declares that he is unable to decide the question; but Fuller is not superior to Heylin in candour, and far below him in accuracy; besides, it is not certain that Fuller had the same privilege of perusing the records of Convocation with Laud and Heylin. The diligent and impartial researches of Strype ended in favour of the genuineness of the clause: the question is now purely one of literary curiosity, because the Article with the disputed clause was afterwards confirmed by Parliament.”—Carwithen’s *History of the Church of England*, Vol. II. pp. 54, 55.

them as had been distinguished by any public character, to make an open and solemn confession of their faith; not in the very words of holy Scripture, which had been perverted and misunderstood, because that would have been ineffectual to the purpose intended; but in others more fully, and distinctly setting forth the true sense and interpretation of those words. With this view it was, that the Fathers of Nice inserted into their Creed those clauses, which declare the true Divinity of our Blessed LORD, against Arius; that not long after, in opposition to the heresy of Macedonius, others were added by the General Council of Constantinople, to assert the Divinity of the HOLY SPIRIT; and that in the next century, though no further change was made in the Creed, other declarations of the true faith, concerning the Incarnation of CHRIST, and the Personal Union of His two Natures, were composed by General Synods assembled at Ephesus and Chalcedon, when the two opposite heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches first showed themselves in the world. In these later times, indeed, this authority hath been very much abused; instead of Articles of faith, men have been compelled to declare their assent, not only to disputable opinions, but to such as are evidently contrary, as well to the principles of natural reason, as to the holy Scriptures, and the doctrine of the best ages; and those worthy men, whom GOD endued with power from on high, to withstand these unjust impositions, have been exposed to so many and great trials, as even the first Christians endured in the Heathen persecutions. These practices, together with the principles from which they proceed, can hardly be too much detested: but shall we then, instead of reforming these or the like abuses, quite discard that sacred authority which hath been abused? . . .

But I am in hopes, that in the opinion of every true son of this Church, it will be a sufficient confutation of all innovations, which have been, or hereafter shall be, advanced, to say with St. Paul, "we have no such custom, neither the Churches of GOD;" or, in the words of our Blessed LORD, "from the beginning it was not so." To become the author of new Hypotheses in Religion, or to

call those doctrines into question, which have always been firmly believed in the Church, even from the most early ages to our times, savours more of the pride and arrogance of some vain-glorious philosopher, who by making strange discoveries, and contradicting the rest of the world, seeks to raise in others a great esteem of himself, than of the humility of a good Christian ; whose chief glory consists in the entire resignation of his understanding, and the steadfast belief of all the truths, which GOD hath revealed to him, whether he doth, or doth not, clearly comprehend them. I speak not of improvements in the liberal arts and sciences ; which had their rise from study and observation, and therefore must be advanced, and perfected in the same method : whereas the Christian Religion having been completely published to the world by our Blessed LORD and His Apostles, no addition can be made to it without a new Revelation. Here, then, is no room for invention or discovery ; but, on the contrary, if any doctrine be new, if it be not truly Primitive and Apostolical, we may, safely, without further examination, reject it as false and spurious, and no part of “ the faith once delivered to the Saints.” Whence our best writers, as well in their controversies with the Papists, as with other sectaries and heretics, constantly appeal to the judgment and practice of the Church in the next centuries after the Apostles : which as she had better means of information, than can be pretended to in any succeeding age, so cannot reasonably be supposed, either through negligence or design, and this, in all parts of the world at once, to have depraved the faith, whilst her Pastors, and other chief members, were daily suffering martyrdom in its defence : and few there are, or rather none at all, as far as I have been able to observe, who refuse to allow the testimony of the primitive writers its due weight and authority, such only excepted, as have not read them, or are afraid of their evidence, and, therefore, in order to divert us from the true sense of the holy Scriptures, (in discovering which those interpreters have commonly the best success, who most carefully compare them with other books of the same or the next ages, as the best

critics always do in explaining other authors) would strictly confine us to the mere words, because these alone, and unsupported, may more easily be forced to countenance their innovations.—*Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford. Works, Vol. I. pp. 283—296.*

There is not, therefore, the least ground to think, that the practice of the Church in this respect is contrary to Scripture. Let us now see, whether this writer hath succeeded better in another accusation he hath brought against it, viz. that it is Popish. I have allowed that this practice hath been abused to very ill ends by the Church of Rome; which, instead of explaining the true sense of Scripture, hath invented and imposed new Articles of faith, contrary both to Scripture and reason. Which doth by no means satisfy this writer, who will, therefore, have the practice itself to be Popish; for unless he means this, he would, instead of contradicting me, say only the same thing I have done before. He pretends, that “by this engine it was that step by step came on the claim of Infallibility,” (p. 252.) Whereby, if he understands that the authority of the Church was through the ambition of some men, and the negligence of others, so far by degrees increased and abused, that at length a claim of Infallibility was set up, he affirms nothing more than what I have allowed, that this authority hath been much abused; but then I must still put him in mind, that the abuse of authority in one age is no just ground for laying it aside in another. But if he would have it thought that the claim of Infallibility is a certain or necessary concomitant, or consequent, of this authority as exercised at the Council of Nice, or the other General Councils mentioned by me, he must pardon me if this be not granted; for there is nothing more evident in History, than that no such authority was either then, or for many hundred years after, claimed by any person in the world. Nay, so far was any thing done in these Councils from giving birth to the exorbitant power of the Pope, who claims this Infallibility, that the Popish writers have never been able to prove, that in several of them he was allowed

That there is nothing Popish in the doctrine that the Church has authority in matters of faith.

so much as to preside ; and even in the last of them, that at Chalcedon, the See of Constantinople was, notwithstanding the warm and earnest opposition of the Pope's Legates, put upon the level with that of Rome, agreeably to what had been before decreed at Constantinople in the second General Council. These Councils, therefore, are so many plain proofs against the Pope's authority, and are commonly insisted on as such by the Protestant writers. Neither doth it appear, that any authority was there exercised in relation to the interpretation of Scripture, which is not exercised or approved by the Church of England and other Protestant Churches : for in these there are Creeds, or Confessions of faith ; and such as reject any of the principal Articles of these Creeds, or Confessions, are commonly debarred both from Holy Orders, and also from Communion. This, therefore, having been the practice of Protestant Churches, and particularly of the Church of England, ever since the Reformation, which cannot be questioned, will, I hope, be excused from the imputation of serving the Popish claim of Infallibility ; unless it can be supposed, that the Protestant Churches, and this from the very beginning, have generally so far misunderstood, or acted inconsistently with their own principles, as to retain the very essence of Popery. But to give some show or colour of Popery to the practice of which I have been speaking, this writer hath filled his discourse with long and heavy complaints of the injustice of denying Christians the liberty of examining, and judging for themselves ; in which unfair proceeding of his, I desire leave once more to say, that I am no further concerned than the body of Protestants ; who, as they invite men to read the Scriptures, and to see with their own eyes, so have never denied the Church authority to judge what persons are qualified for her Communion and for Holy Orders.

I must not forget under this head, that I am again charged not only with favouring Popery, but with being a Papist in disguise, with "acknowledging the Protestant principles for decency sake, but steadfastly adhering to the Popish" (p. 275), and all this, as it seems, for having

referred you to the practice and writers of the Primitive times, and of the next ages after the Apostles; whereby I am represented to understand the reign of Constantine, which happened, as he saith (pp. 270—274), almost three hundred years after. Now I am not in the least apprehensive of my being suspected as a favourer of Popery by any man, who knows the true meaning of Popery; but sure it is such a compliment to the Popish Religion, as no Protestant would have made, who understands his own principles, to date its rise from the time of Constantine; the claim of Infallibility, and of the Papal Supremacy, as now exercised, the doctrine of Transubstantiation, Invocation of Saints, Image Worship, Prayers in an unknown tongue, forbidding laymen to read the Scriptures, to say nothing of other peculiar tenets of the Church of Rome, having never been heard of during the reign of this great Emperor, or for a long time after; as a very little insight into the Popish Controversies, or Ecclesiastical Historians, would have informed this writer. It would have been much more to his purpose, and equally consistent with truth and justice, to have told his readers that by the next ages after the Apostles, I meant the times immediately preceding the Reformation: but then one opportunity would have been lost of declaiming against the times wherein the Nicene Creed was composed, and Arianism condemned. As to the primitive writers I am not ashamed, or afraid to repeat, that the best method of interpreting Scripture seems to me to be the having recourse to the writers, who lived nearest the time wherein the Scriptures were first published, that is, to the next ages after the Apostles; and that a diligent inquiry into the faith and practice of the Church in the same ages, would be the most effectual way, next after the study of the Scriptures themselves, to prevent innovations in Doctrine; and, lastly, that this hath been practised with great success by some of our best advocates for the Protestant cause, as Bishop Jewel, for example, Archbishop Laud, Archbishop Usher, Bishop Cosins, Bishop Stillingfleet, Dr. Barrow, Bishop Bull, with many others at home and abroad. To which it will be

replied: That "our best writers, at least, in their controversies with the Papists, are so far from appealing to the judgment of the Church in the next centuries after the Apostles, in any such sense as the Bishop is arguing for against his adversaries; that the very best of them, Mr. Chillingworth, has declared upon the most mature consideration, how uncertain generally, how self-contradictory sometimes, how insufficient always he esteemed this judgment to be. He had seen Fathers against Fathers, Councils against Councils, the consent of one age against the consent of another; the same Fathers contradicting themselves, and the like, and he found no rest but in the Protestant rule of faith. He was willing to yield to every thing as truth, *Quod semper, ubique et ab omnibus*; because he well judged that nothing could be conceived to be embraced as truth at the very beginning, and so continue in all places, and at all times, but what was delivered at the beginning. But he saw, with respect to some controverted points, how early the difference of sentiment was." (Pp. 265, 266.) In answer to this, I shall not take upon me to determine what rank Mr. Chillingworth ought to bear among the Protestant writers; it being sufficient for my purpose, that many others, and those of chief note for learning and judgment, in their controversies with the Papists and others, have appealed, and this in the manner I have recommended, to the Primitive writers, as every one may soon learn who will take the pains to look into their books. In the next place, it appears from this very passage of Mr. Chillingworth, as here represented, that this design was to prevent appealing to Fathers and Councils as a rule of faith; agreeably whereunto I have all along declared, that, in my opinion, the Scripture is the only rule of faith, and have no further recommended the study of the Primitive writers, than as the best method of discovering the true sense of Scripture. In the third place, here is nothing expressly said by Mr. Chillingworth of the most Primitive writers or Councils, or of any who lived in the next ages after the Apostles; but he may very well be understood, notwithstanding any thing here produced, of those latter

ages wherein both Fathers and Councils degenerated from the faith and Doctrine of those who went before them; which is the more likely, because mention here follows of the Article which divided the Greeks from the Roman Communion; this having not been openly disputed before the seventh century. Fourthly, he is introduced as speaking in express terms of controverted points, but saying nothing of any principal point of faith, nothing of any Article which was originally in the Nicene Creed. On the contrary it may be observed, in the last place, that he plainly speaks of doctrines received by the Church in all places and at all times, even from the very beginning, which, for that reason, he presumed not to reject.¹ Now

¹ See ante, pp. 62, 63. CHILLINGWORTH was no enemy to Catholic Tradition; for he observes to his Roman antagonist, "That the Church's interpretation of Scripture is always true—that is it which you would have said: and that in some sense may be also admitted; viz. if you speak of that Church (which before you spake of in the 14th §,) that is, of the Church *in all ages* since the Apostles. Upon the Tradition of which Church you there told us—we were to receive the Scripture, and to believe it to be the Word of God. The Tradition then of this Church, you say, must teach us what is Scripture; *and we are willing to believe it.* And now, if you make it good unto us, that the same Tradition, down from the Apostles, hath delivered from age to age, and from hand to hand, any interpretation of any Scripture, *we are ready to embrace that also.* If there be any traditive interpretation of Scripture, produce it, and prove it to be so; *and we embrace it.* But the Tradition of all ages is one thing; and the authority of the present Church, much more of the Roman Church, which is but a part, and a corrupted part of the Catholic Church, is another. And therefore, though we are ready to receive *both Scripture and the sense of Scripture, upon the authority of original Tradition*, yet we receive neither the one nor the other, upon the authority of your Church."—*Religion of Protestants*, c. ii. § 88, 89. *Works*, Vol. I. pp. 262, 263. Edit. 1820.—Again: "All but cavillers will easily understand the meaning of the [VI.] Article to be, that all Divine verities, which CHRIST revealed to His Apostles, and the Apostles taught the Churches, are contained in Scripture; that is, all the material objects of our faith, whereof the Scripture is none, but only the means of conveying them unto us; which we believe not finally, and for itself, but for the matter contained in it. So that, if men did believe the Doctrine contained in Scripture, it should no way hinder their salvation, not to know whether there were any Scripture or no. Those barbarous nations, Irenæus speaks of, were in this case, and yet no doubt but they might be saved."—§ 32. *Ibid.* p. 225. "It is superfluous for you to prove out of St. Athanasius, and St. Austin, that we must receive the sacred Canon upon the credit of God's Church: understanding by Church, as here you

it cannot possibly be known what these are, without having recourse to the writers of the Primitive ages. So that, upon the whole, the method I have recommended is so far from being contradicted, that it is rather enforced by what this writer hath cited from Mr. Chillingworth.—*Defence of the Charge*, p. 358.

explain yourself, the credit of Tradition. And that not the Tradition of the present Church, which we pretend may deviate from the ancient, but—such a Tradition, which involves an evidence of fact, and from hand to hand, from age to age, bringeth us up to the times and persons of the Apostles, and our SAVIOUR Himself, cometh to be confirmed by all these miracles and other arguments, whereby they convinced their doctrines to be true.—Thus you. Now prove the Canon of Scripture which you receive, by such Tradition, and we will allow it: prove your whole Doctrine, or the infallibility of your Church by such Tradition, *and we will yield to you in all things.*”—§ 52. *Ibid.* pp. 238, 239.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

THE ALTAR SERVICE.

ALLUSIONS have been made, in the course of this work, to the Catholic doctrine of a *commemorative sacrifice* in the Eucharist; and, in the note at the foot of page 27, a wish is expressed for the restoration of the Prayer of Oblation. It must not, however, be inferred from this, that, in the opinion of the Editor, there is “no truth and certainty of oblation in the English Liturgy,” and, therefore, that “it is illegitimate.”¹ All he contends for is,

¹ “It is objected that there is no oblation, at least no truth and certainty of oblation, in the English Liturgy, and, therefore, it is illegitimate. [Assemani Codex Liturgicus, tom. VI. p. xevi. Bp. Scott, Collier, Vol. II. p. 428. Schultingius, Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica, tom. IV. pars 2.] I reply, that every oblation recognised by the Christian Church is contained in the English Liturgy. There are the offerings of prayer and alms, the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, the oblation of God’s creatures of bread and wine, the reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice of ourselves, our souls, and bodies, unto God. There is the whole rational, unbloody, and spiritual service, including the commemoration of the sacrifice once offered by CHRIST, of His body pierced, and His blood shed, for mankind. All this holy service is offered to the honour and glory of God, and infinitely surpasses the bloody and typical sacrifices of the Law. And it is as *validly* and *effectually* administered by the English Liturgy, as by any other in existence. It is absurd in Romanists to object, that the English Liturgy is devoid of the service offered in commemoration of that sacrifice which CHRIST once completed; for some of their own Doctors teach, that this oblation is effected by the separate consecration of the bread and wine, which they know to exist in the English Liturgy. Not,

that the Altar Service, as it stands in the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI., is not only more beautiful, but also more in accordance with the most ancient Liturgies and those now used by the Reformed Catholics in Scotland and America, than our present Communion Office; and, consequently, that the substitution of the former for the latter would greatly improve our admirable Liturgy.¹

In support of this opinion, the Editor will here place before the reader the Prayer of Consecration and Oblation, as it stands in the *first* Prayer-Book of Edward VI.; the corresponding Prayers in the Scotch and American Liturgies; and the second part, or *Anaphora* of the primitive Liturgy² of the Church of Jerusalem.

I.

Then the Priest, turning him to the Altar, shall say, or sing, plainly and distinctly, the prayer following.

Almighty and everlasting God, which, by Thy holy Apostle, hast taught us to make prayers and supplications,

indeed, that we admit this doctrine of theirs, for there is no proof that the memorial of CHRIST's sacrifice is performed by consecration alone, and not by the whole service which He has enjoined."—Palmer's *Origines Liturgicæ*, Vol. II. c. iv. p. 14.

¹ The Biographer of Archbishop SHARP informs us, that "though he [the Abp.] admired the Communion Service as it now stands, yet, in his own private judgment, *he preferred that in King Edward's first Service-Book before it*, as a more proper office for the celebration of those mysteries." Vol. I. p. 355. Bishop HORSLEY thus expressed himself upon the Eucharistic Office, as it is used in Scotland, in a letter to Bishop Drummond, of Edinburgh, dated 16th October, 1799: "Your Communion Office is really a very fine and edifying composition. Our Office, as it stood in King Edward's first Prayer-Book, was nearly, I think, the same; and *I have long lamented the alterations* that were made to humour those who, we find by experience, will never be satisfied."—See Bishop Jolly *On the Eucharist*, &c., p. 121. Edit. 1831.

² The term Liturgy is here employed in that restricted sense which it generally bears in the writings of the ancients, namely, as denoting the service used in the celebration of the Eucharist.—See Palmer's *Origines*, Vol. i. p. 3.

and to give thanks for all men. We humbly beseech Thee, most mercifully to receive these our prayers which we offer unto Thy Divine Majesty, beseeching Thee to inspire continually the Universal Church with the SPIRIT of truth, unity and concord. And grant that all they that do confess Thy holy Name, may agree in the truth of Thy holy Word, and live in unity and godly love. Specially we beseech Thee to save and defend Thy servant EDWARD our king, that under him we may be godly and quietly governed. And grant unto his whole Council, and to all that be put in authority under him, that they may truly and indifferently minister justice to the punishment of wickedness and vice, and to the maintenance of GOD's true Religion and virtue. Give grace (O heavenly FATHER) to all Bishops, Pastors and Curates, that they may both by their life and doctrine set forth Thy true and lively Word, and rightly and duly administer Thy holy Sacraments, and to all Thy people give Thy heavenly grace, that with meek heart and due reverence, they may hear and receive Thy holy Word, truly serving Thee in holiness and righteousness, all the days of their life. And we most humbly beseech Thee of Thy goodness (O LORD) to comfort and succour all them, which in this transitory life be in trouble, sorrow, need, sickness, or any other adversity. And especially we commend unto Thy merciful goodness, this congregation which is here assembled in Thy Name to celebrate the commemoration of the most glorious death of Thy SON: and here we do give unto Thee most high praise and hearty thanks, for the wonderful grace and virtue declared in all Thy Saints, from the beginning of the world. And chiefly in the glorious and most blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of Thy SON JESU CHRIST our LORD and GOD, and in the holy Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles, and Martyrs, whose examples (O LORD) and steadfastness in Thy faith, and keeping Thy holy commandments, grant us to follow.

We commend unto Thy mercy (O LORD) all other Thy servants, which are departed hence from us, with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace. Grant

unto them, we beseech Thee, Thy mercy and everlasting peace, and that at the day of the general resurrection, we and all they which be of the mystical body of Thy SON, may altogether be set on His right hand, and hear that His most joyful voice, Come unto Me, O ye that be blessed of My FATHER, and possess the kingdom which is prepared for you, from the beginning of the world. Grant this, O FATHER, for JESUS CHRIST'S sake, our only Mediator and Advocate.

O GOD, heavenly FATHER, which of Thy tender mercy didst give Thine only SON JESU CHRIST, to suffer death upon the cross, for our redemption, who made there (by His one oblation once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world, and did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us, to celebrate a perpetual memory, of that His precious death, until his coming again. Hear us (O merciful FATHER), we beseech Thee, and with Thy HOLY SPIRIT and Word, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us, the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved SON JESUS CHRIST. Who in the same night that He was betrayed, took bread, and when He had blessed and given thanks, He brake it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, Take, eat: This is my Body, which is given for you: do this in remembrance of Me. Likewise after supper He took the cup, and when he had given thanks He gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this, for This is my Blood of the New Testament which is shed for you and for many, for remission of sins: do this, as oft as you drink it, in remembrance of Me.

These words before rehearsed are to be said, turning still to the Altar, without any elevation or showing the Sacrament to the People.

The
Oblation.

Wherefore, O LORD and heavenly FATHER, according to the institution of Thy dearly beloved SON, our SAVIOUR JESU CHRIST, we Thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy

holy Gifts, the memory of all which Thy SON hath willed us to make, having in remembrance His blessed passion, mighty resurrection and glorious ascension, rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same, entirely desiring Thy fatherly goodness to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, most humbly beseeching thee to grant that by the merits and death of Thy SON JESUS CHRIST and through faith in His blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His passion. And here we offer and present unto Thee (O LORD) ourself, our souls, and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee, humbly beseeching Thee that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of Thy SON JESUS CHRIST, and be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with Thy SON JESUS CHRIST, that He may dwell in them and they in Him. And although we be unworthy (through our manifold sins) to offer unto Thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, and command these our prayers and supplications, by the ministry of Thy holy Angels to be brought into Thy holy Tabernacle before the sight of Thy Divine Majesty, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences through CHRIST our LORD: by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the HOLY GHOST, all honour and glory be unto Thee, O FATHER Almighty, world without end. Amen. — *The Booke of the Common Praier and Administration of the Sacramentes and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church; after the Use of the Church of England.* [First Edit.] Anno Do. 1549.

II.

In the Altar Service of the Church in Scotland, the Prayer for the whole state of CHRIST'S Church is not combined with the Consecration Prayer, as in the preceding Office. There are also some other

unimportant alterations. The Prayer of Consecration and Oblation is as follows :—

All glory be to Thee, Almighty GOD, our heavenly FATHER, for that Thou of Thy tender mercy didst give Thine only SON JESUS CHRIST, to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who, by His own oblation of Himself once offered, made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to continue a perpetual memorial of that His precious death and sacrifice until His coming again. For in the night that He was betrayed, He took bread;¹ and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, Take, eat: This is my Body, which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of Me. Likewise after supper, He took the cup; and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this, for This is my Blood, of the New Testament, which is shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of Me.

The Oblation.

Wherefore, O LORD and heavenly FATHER, according to the institution of Thy dearly beloved SON, our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, we Thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, which we now offer unto Thee, the memorial Thy SON hath commanded us to make; having in remembrance His blessed passion and precious death, His mighty resurrection and glorious ascension, rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same. And we most humbly beseech Thee, O merciful FATHER, to hear us, and of Thy Almighty goodness, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with Thy Word and HOLY SPIRIT, these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may become the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved SON. And we earnestly desire Thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of

¹ The manual rites are exactly according to the English Office.

praise and thanksgiving, most humbly beseeching Thee to grant, that by the merits and death of Thy SON JESUS CHRIST, and through faith in His blood, we, and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His passion. And here we humbly offer and present unto Thee, O LORD, ourselves, our souls, and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee; beseeching Thee, that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy communion, may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of Thy SON JESUS CHRIST, and be filled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with Him, that He may dwell in them, and they in Him. And although we are unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto Thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through JESUS CHRIST our LORD: by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the HOLY GHOST, all honour and glory be unto Thee, O FATHER Almighty, world without end. Amen.

This Form is an improved version of that in the Prayer-Book of 1637, which was partly arranged by Laud, and printed at Edinburgh by Robert Young.¹

III.

The Prayers of Consecration and Oblation in the Liturgy of the Anglican Church in America, ratified by the Convention of that Church the 16th of October, 1789, are essentially the same as those in the

¹ In the MS. copy of the Book of Common Prayer for the use of the Church of Scotland, [in the British Museum, 11. R. g.] "as it was sett downe at first, before the change thereof made by the Archbishop of Canturburye," the Prayer of Oblation is wanting.

Liturgy of Scotland. The principal difference occurs in the Invocation, which is as follows :—

“And we most humbly beseech Thee, O merciful FATHER, to hear us, and of thy Almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with thy Word and HOLY SPIRIT these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine; *that we, receiving them according to Thy SON our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST’S holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood.*”

[The words in italics are not in the Scotch Office.]

IV.

THE PRIMITIVE LITURGY OF THE CHURCH OF JERUSALEM.¹

PRIEST.

The Love of the FATHER, the Grace of the SON, and the Communion of the HOLY GHOST, be with you all.

¹ Translated by Dr. Thomas Rattray, of Craighall, in Scotland, and printed in London, in 1744, in a thin 4to. with the following title :—

“The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem, being the Liturgy of St. James, freed from all latter additions and interpolations of whatever kind, and so restored to its original purity: by comparing it with the account given of that Liturgy by St. Cyril, in his fifth Mystagogical Catechism, and with the Clementine Liturgy, &c.

Containing in so many different columns,

- I. The Liturgy of St. James, as we have it at present, the interpolations being only printed in a smaller character.
- II. The same Liturgy without these interpolations, or the Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem.
- III. St. Cyril’s account of that Liturgy in his Vth Mystagogical Catechism.
- IV. The Clementine Liturgy.
- V. So much of the corresponding parts of the Liturgies of St. Mark, St. Chrysostom, and St. Basil, as may serve for illustrating and confirming it.

With an English Translation and Notes, as also an Appendix, containing some other ancient prayers, of all which an account is given in the Preface. London: Printed by James Bettenham. MDCCXCIV.” Pages 122.

There

PEOPLE.

And with thy spirit.

PRIEST.

Lift up *your* hearts.

PEOPLE.

We lift them up unto the LORD.

PRIEST.

Let us give thanks unto the LORD.

PEOPLE.

It is meet and right.

PRIEST.

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty to praise Thee, [to sing Hymns to Thee,] to bless Thee, to worship Thee, to glorify Thee, to give thanks to Thee, the Maker of all creatures visible and invisible, [the Treasure of eternal good things, the Fountain of life and immortality, the God and Governor of the universe ;] to whom the heavens sing praise, with all their hosts, the sun and moon, and the whole choir of stars, the earth and sea, and all things that are in them: the angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities, authorities, and tremendous powers,

There is a long and very interesting dissertation on the Liturgy of Jerusalem in the *Origines Liturgiæ*, Vol. I. pp. 15—44. Mr. Palmer observes, (p. 42,) "In conclusion I may remark, that there are satisfactory means of ascertaining the order, substance, and generally the expressions, of the solemn Liturgy used all through the Patriarchate of Antioch and Jerusalem, before the year 451; that the Liturgy thus ascertained coincides with the notices which the Fathers of that country give concerning their Liturgy, during the fifth and fourth centuries; that this Liturgy was used in the whole Patriarchate of Antioch in the fourth century, with little variety; that it prevailed there in the third century, and even in the second. The Liturgy of St. James in Greek and Syriac, may therefore be considered to be derived from the most primitive times. And should we say that the same form in its principal features had existed from the time of the Apostles, I think that we should have good reasons for making the assertion."

the many-eyed cherubim, and the seraphim with six wings, who with twain cover their faces, and with twain their feet, and with twain they fly; crying one to another, with never-ceasing voices, and uninterrupted shouts of praise; [singing with a loud voice the triumphal hymn to Thine exalted glory, shouting, glorifying, crying aloud,] and saying,

PEOPLE.

Holy, Holy, Holy, LORD of Sabaoth, heaven and earth are full of Thy glory.

Hosanna in the highest: Blessed be He that cometh in the Name of the LORD: Hosanna in the highest.

PRIEST.

Holy art Thou, O eternal King, and the Giver of all holiness. Holy is Thine only-begotten SON, our LORD JESUS CHRIST, by whom Thou madest the worlds. Holy also is Thy HOLY SPIRIT, who searcheth all things, even the depths of Thee, O GOD. Holy art Thou, who rulest over all, Almighty and good GOD, terrible, yet full of compassion; but especially indulgent to the workmanship of Thine own hands. *For Thou* didst make man, formed out of the earth, after Thine own Image, and graciously gavest him the enjoyment of Paradise. And when he had lost his happiness by transgressing Thy commandments, Thou, of Thy goodness, didst not despise nor abandon him, but didst discipline him as a merciful Father, recall him by the Law, and train him up by the pedagogy of the Prophets. And last of all, Thou didst send Thine only-begotten SON, our LORD JESUS CHRIST, into the world, that by His coming He might renew [and revive] Thy image in us: who descended from heaven, and was incarnate by the HOLY GHOST of the Virgin Mary, conversed with mankind, and directed His whole Dispensation to our Salvation. And when the hour was come, that He who had no sin was to suffer a voluntary and life-giving death upon the cross for us sinners, in the same night that He was betrayed, or rather offered up Himself for the life and salvation of the world,

Taking bread into His holy and immaculate hands, looking up to heaven and presenting it to Thee, His GOD and FATHER, He gave thanks, sanctified and broke it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, Take, eat, This is my Body, which is broken and given for you, for the remission of sins.

In like manner, after supper, He took the cup, and having mixed it of wine and water,¹ He gave thanks, sanctified and blessed it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, Drink ye all of this; This is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed and given for you and for many, for the remission of sins, Do this in remembrance of Me.

Wherefore, in commemoration of His [life-giving Passion, salutary cross,] death, [burial] and resurrection from the dead on the third day, His ascension into heaven, and sitting at the right hand of Thee, His GOD and FATHER, and His second glorious and terrible advent, when He shall come again with glory to judge the quick and the dead, and shall render to every one according to his works, we [sinners] offer to Thee, O LORD, this tremendous and unbloody Sacrifice: Beseeching Thee, that thou wouldest not deal with us after our sins, nor reward us after our iniquities; but, according to Thy clemency and ineffable love to mankind, overlooking and blotting out the handwriting that is against us Thy servants, wouldest grant us Thy heavenly and eternal gifts; for Thy people and Thy Church make their supplications unto Thee.

Have mercy upon us, O LORD GOD, Almighty FATHER, have mercy upon us according to Thy great mercy; and send down Thy HOLY SPIRIT upon us, and upon these gifts which are here set before Thee, that by His descent upon them, He may make this bread the holy Body of Thy CHRIST; and this cup the precious Blood of Thy CHRIST; that they may be to all who partake of them, for remission of sins, and for life everlasting, [for the sanctifi-

¹ "The Church of England has never prohibited this custom [of mixing water with the wine] which is primitive and canonical."—*Origines Liturgiæ*, Vol. II. pp. 13, 14.

cation of soul and body, for bringing forth the fruit of good works.]

We offer to Thee, O LORD, for Thy Holy [Catholic and Apostolic] Church throughout the whole world; do Thou now also plentifully furnish her with the rich gifts of Thy HOLY SPIRIT.

Remember, O LORD, the holy Bishops in the same, who rightly divide the Word of truth.

Remember, O LORD, this our city, and every city and country, with all the faithful that dwell in them; preserve them in peace and safety.

Remember, O LORD, our Christian [fathers and] brethren that travel by sea, or by land, or are in foreign countries, that are in chains or imprisonments, that are in captivity or banishment, in the mines, under torture, or in hard slavery.

Remember, O LORD, those that are sick or diseased, and such as are infested with unclean spirits, and make haste to heal and deliver them.

Remember, O LORD, every Christian soul under affliction or calamity, and who stand in need of Thy Divine mercy and help. *Remember* also the conversion of those that are in error.

Remember, O LORD, *those* [our fathers and brethren] who labour and minister to us, for Thy holy Name's sake.

Remember all, O LORD, for good; have mercy upon all, O LORD; be reconciled to us all; settle the flocks of Thy people in peace; remove all scandals; make wars to cease; put a stop to the violence of heresies; and grant us Thy peace and love, O GOD our SAVIOUR, and the Hope of all the ends of the earth.

Remember, O LORD, *to grant us* temperate weather, moderate showers, pleasant dews, and plenty of the fruits of the earth, and *to bless* the whole circuit of the year with Thy goodness; for the eyes of all hope in Thee, and Thou givest them food in due season; Thou openest Thy hand, and fillest every living creature with Thy gracious bounty.

Remember, O LORD, all who bring forth fruit, and do good works in Thy holy Churches, and who are mindful of

the poor; the widows, orphans, strangers, and indigent persons, and all who desire to be remembered in our prayers.

Vouchsafe, also, O LORD, to remember those who have this day offered these oblations at Thy holy Altar, and for whom every one has offered, or has in his thoughts, and those whose names we have lately read before Thee.

Remember, O LORD, according to the multitude of Thy mercies and compassions, me Thy unworthy and unprofitable servant, and all the Deacons who compass Thy holy Altar, and grant to them an unblameable life, preserve them unspotted in their ministry, and purchase for them good degrees. That we may *all* find mercy and favour, with all Thy Saints, who, from the beginning of the world, have pleased Thee in their several generations, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, and every just spirit made perfect in the faith of Thy CHRIST.

DEACON.

Remember, O LORD our GOD.

PRIEST.

Remember, O LORD, the GOD of spirits and of all flesh, those [orthodox] whom we have remembered, and those also whom we have not remembered, from righteous Abel even unto this day. Do Thou give them rest in the region of the living, in the delights of Paradise, in the bosoms of our holy fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, whence sorrow, grief, and lamentation are banished away, where the light of Thy countenance visits and shines continually.

And dispose the end of our lives, O LORD, in peace, that they may be Christian, well pleasing to Thee, and free from sin, gathering us under the feet of Thine Elect; [when Thou wilt, and as Thou wilt, only without shame and offence], through Thy only-begotten SON, our LORD and GOD and SAVIOUR, JESUS CHRIST, for He alone appeared without sin upon the earth, with whom Thou art blessed and glorified, together with Thy HOLY SPIRIT, now and ever, world without end.

PEOPLE.

Amen.

PRIEST.

Peace be with you all.

PEOPLE.

And with thy spirit.

DEACON.

Let us again and again [and for ever] pray to the LORD [in peace].

Let us pray for the gifts which are offered to the LORD GOD, that the LORD our GOD, receiving them upon His heavenly Altar for a sweet-smelling savour, would send down upon us the divine grace and the gift of His HOLY SPIRIT.

2. *Let us pray* for the peace and tranquillity of the whole world, and of the holy Churches of GOD.

Let us pray for those who have offered these gifts, and for whom every one has offered, or has in his thoughts; and for all the people that stand about the Altar; 3. for the remission of our sins, and the propitiation of our souls.

Let us pray for every soul that is in affliction or calamity, and stands in need of the mercy and help of GOD; and for the conversion of those that are in error; for health to the sick; for deliverance to the captives; and for rest to our fathers and brethren who have gone before us. Let us all earnestly say, LORD, have mercy.

PEOPLE.

LORD, have mercy.

PRIEST.

Vouchsafe us, O LORD, thou lover of men, with freedom, without condemnation, and with a pure heart, to call upon Thee, the holy GOD, who art in the heavens, as our Father, and say,

Our Father, &c.

PRIEST.

Peace be with you.

PEOPLE.

And with thy spirit.

DEACON.

Let us bow down our heads unto the LORD.

PEOPLE.

To Thee, O LORD.

PRIEST.

We Thy servants, O LORD, bow down our necks to Thee, before Thy holy Altar, in expectation of Thy rich mercies. Send down upon us, O LORD, Thine abundant grace and benediction; and sanctify our souls and bodies, that we may be made worthy to be communicants and partakers of Thy holy mysteries, for the remission of our sins, and for life everlasting. For to Thee, O God, belong adoration and glory, and to Thy only-begotten SON, and HOLY SPIRIT, now and for ever.

PEOPLE.

Amen.

PRIEST.

Grace be with you all.

PEOPLE.

And with thy spirit.

DEACON.

Let us attend in the fear of God.

PRIEST.

Holy things for holy persons.

PEOPLE.

There is One Holy, one LORD JESUS CHRIST, to the glory of God the FATHER, to whom be glory for ever.

Then shall the officiating Priest receive the Eucharist in both kinds himself: and afterwards proceed to deliver the same unto the People.

At giving the Bread to every one was said.

PRIEST.

The Body of CHRIST.

RESP.

Amen.

And at giving the Cup.

PRIEST.

The Blood of CHRIST.

RESP.

Amen.

The 34th Psalm was sung during distribution. After all have communicated, the Deacon shall say:

Let us give thanks to our GOD, that He hath vouchsafed to make us partakers of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, for the remission of sins, and for life everlasting. And let us pray unto Him, that He would keep us unblameable, as He is good and a lover of men.

PRIEST.

O GOD, who of Thy great goodness and inexpressible love to man, dost condescend to the weakness of Thy servants, we give thanks to Thee, that Thou hast vouchsafed to make us partakers of this heavenly table. Let not the receiving of Thy unspotted Mysteries be to the condemnation of us sinners, but keep us, good GOD, in the sanctification of Thy HOLY SPIRIT, that being made holy, we may obtain a part and inheritance with all Thy saints, who have pleased Thee from the beginning of the world; through the mercy of Thy only-begotten SON, our LORD and GOD and

SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, with whom and Thy HOLY SPIRIT,
Thou art blessed, now and for ever, world without end.

PEOPLE.

Amen.

DEACON.

Let us bow down our heads unto the LORD.

PRIEST.

O GOD, great and wonderful, look upon Thy servants,
who bow down their necks unto Thee; stretch forth Thy
powerful hand, full of blessings, and bless Thy people.
Preserve Thine inheritance, that we may continually glorify
Thee, for ever, the only living and true GOD; for to Thee,
O FATHER, belong glory, honour, adoration, and thanks-
giving, and to Thy SON and HOLY SPIRIT, now and ever.

PEOPLE.

Amen.

DEACON.

Depart in peace.

It is one thing to maintain against Romanists that
our present Communion Service contains all that is
essential to its *validity*, and another, to desire its
further *improvement*. Let the candid reader com-
pare the Offices of the first Prayer-Book of Edward
VI., and of the reformed Church in Scotland and
America with the Primitive Liturgy of Jerusalem,
and he will see how much nearer *they* correspond
with that venerable Service than with our own.
It is related of Bishop OVERALL, that he always
used the oblatory Prayer ("O LORD and heavenly
FATHER," &c.) when he had consecrated the Sacra-

ment, and when that was done, communicated to the people, and ended with the thanksgiving. "This method," Bishop Jolly truly observes, (*On the Eucharist*, p. 133,) "went a great way to restore the essential parts of the first Office," but it is a grave question whether a deviation from the strict letter of the Rubric can, *under any circumstances*, be justified.

No. II.

The following extract from the Appendix to Bishop JEBB'S *Practical Sermons*, may serve to illustrate the quotation from his writings respecting the "regard for ancient faith and piety," displayed in the Liturgy, which is cited in the note at page 11 of this work.

It remains, however, that the liturgical department of evidence [to our Church's reverence for Antiquity] be somewhat more specially examined. Our Church, then, throughout her Formularies, speaks of the Church Catholic, in the language of Antiquity; that is, in the exact forms of speech suggested by the views of Vincentius. He has recorded, with peculiar clearness, the belief of all Catholic Christians in his day. The Church of England has fully recognised that belief in retaining those devotional forms which it universally pervades, and in composing every one of her superadded forms upon the same model. Thus, in the ancient collects which our Church retains, GOD is implored "to keep His Church and household in the true Religion;" to extend His gracious influence to every member, since, "by His SPIRIT, the whole body is governed and sanctified," to keep "His household, the Church, in continual godliness." These, and similar expressions, confined as they are, both in their own original import, and by the most express and uniform authoritative declarations, to the strictly hierarchical Church, as a visible and incorporated polity, imply, by infallible consequence, that it is the interest, no less than the duty, of each individual Christian, to adhere to the fellowship, to study the movement, and, with all possible diligence, to trace the very footsteps

of this heaven-directed Society, in order that he may walk in its light, gain instruction from its monuments, and derive animation from its influence.

When the Church of England addresses GOD in her own words, she no less forcibly utters the same language. She prays "that the Church of GOD may always be preserved from false Apostles, and be ordered and guided by faithful and true pastors:" it is "a holy Church, instructed by heavenly Doctrine;" a structure, which GOD Himself hath raised, "on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, by whose Doctrine we are so to be joined together in unity of spirit, as, through Him who is the chief corner-stone, to become an holy temple, acceptable unto GOD." Finally, it is "the one communion and fellowship of the elect; knit together in the mystical body of our LORD:" and, therefore, we are to seek grace from GOD, "so to follow His blessed saints, in all virtuous and godly living, that, at the last we may come to those unspeakable joys, which GOD hath prepared for those who love him faithfully."

Now, if this be the deliberate judgment of the Church of England; if she ascribe to the Church Catholic such exalted properties; if she deem unity with the Church Catholic so desirable; if she urge the following of the luminaries of the Church Catholic, as the direct path to everlasting bliss,—in what expressions could the truth of Vincentius's principle be more fully recognised; or the feeling under which Vincentius wrote, be answered with more perfect sympathy? And, be it remembered, this recognition and this sympathy are *incidentally* discoverable, in productions which peculiarly speak the language of the heart; in productions above all suspicion of artifice, disguise, or mental reservation; in solemn and affectionate addresses to that Almighty GOD, "unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid."

But to proceed. That desire for "unity of spirit," which was so earnestly expressed in the collect for the festival of Saint Simon and Saint Jude, was made a subject of daily supplication, by the revisers of 1662, in the prayer "for all

sorts and conditions of men." This noble devotional composition, primitive in its spirit, though modern in its date, implores that "good estate of the Catholic Church," in which all wandering sheep shall be brought back to the one fold; and, walking in the way of truth, as partners of the same faith, shall not only endeavour after, but attain and enjoy, the unity of spirit, in the bond of peace. Now, as there is but one way of truth, there can be only one unity of spirit; a blessed unity of mind and heart with the whole Catholic Church; not merely with existing communities of Christians, but with that countless multitude, which has passed on before. For, in truth, this retrospective unity with the Church of old, is the only solid ground for present unity with contemporaries, and for prospective unity with the Church progressive upon earth, and consummated in heaven. A clear and definite principle of union is indispensable; and such a principle cannot either be discovered or conceived, except in "the following of those, who, through faith and patience, have inherited the promises." When, therefore, we pray, that we "may hold the faith in unity of spirit, and in the bond of peace," we pray that we may be partakers in the belief, the spirit, and the everlasting peace, of those, who have, in all ages, been translated from the Church below, to the Church above; from the assembly of saints on earth, to the assembly of the first-born, in the realms of light and love.

But it is by no means in a solitary instance, that we are indebted to the revisers of 1662. Those wise and pious men had a deep reverence for Catholic Antiquity: and from this reverence, they omitted no fair opportunities of giving prominence to the great principles, which constitute the tie between the Church of England, and the purer ages of catholicity. One of the chief agents, was the admirable PEARSON, whose exposition of the Creed, and particularly his incomparable selection of authorities, proves that VINCENTIUS could not have had a more entire disciple. But the attentive observer of what was then effected will perceive the spirit of the workmen, in every touch of their hand. To correct certain departures from Antiquity, which,

at the persuasion of Martin Bucer, but, we have strong reason to believe, against the judgment of the wise and temperate RIDLEY, had crept into the second Book of Edward, was, evidently, their principal object.

One example, for the present, may suffice, as a specimen.

In the first Book of Edward, the commemoration of the pious dead, which had been in practice from the earliest times, was retained, in the prayer for the whole state of CHRIST'S Church; *possibly*, however, with less accommodation than was practically expedient, to the altered taste and feelings of *that period*. Be that as it may, on the second revision in 1551, the entire passage was omitted; and, from that period, until the last revision, the prayer in question ended with the petition for relief to those suffering under need, sickness, or any other adversity. Meantime, the Prayer-Book intended for Scotland, in 1637, had restored the commemoration, in words not very different from those of the original service. The revisers of 1662, in this, as in several other instances, attending to the example of the Scotch Prayer-Book, inserted a judicious, but most impressive compendium of the old commemoration. The passage is at once brief and simple; but *surely* it embraces matter as ample as could be reduced to so small a compass; and as important as can well be conceived, by any disciplined imagination. It, moreover, substantially conveys the leading sentiment of Vincentius. It thanks GOD, "for all His servants departed this life in His faith and fear: beseeching Him to give us grace so to follow their good example, that, with them, we may be partakers of GOD's heavenly kingdom." *It thanks GOD for them*; therefore, we are to regard them, not merely with respect, but with *interest*; as qualified in themselves, and as *designed by Him whom we address*, to be to us, and all who come after, a source of benefit and blessing. And this we do continually, in a prayer constituting an essential part of our most solemn worship: a procedure which implies, that this subject is not merely of occasional use, but of constant, and heart-elevating application. The persons whom we are thus taught and *pledged* to contemplate, (for, to thank GOD

for any benefit, is to pledge ourselves to use it,) these holy and excellent persons, are precisely the same company to whom we are directed by Vincentius; the succession, so far as recorded, of those, “*who have departed this life in God’s faith and fear:*”—“*Qui in fide et communione Catholica, sancte, sapienter, et constanter viventes, vel mori in CHRISTO fideliter, vel occidi pro CHRISTO feliciter meruerint.*” The words *faith* and *fear* embrace the whole of Religion: *faith*, comprises all true principles; *fear*, by a very usual Scriptural figure, comprehends all affections of which God is the object. In asking grace to follow their good example, we express our solicitude to believe, as they believed; and to feel, as they felt: and, in offering this petition thus solemnly and unremittingly, we give our testimony to the importance of this means of guidance, and vehicle of influence. There will be found in our Common Prayer no such weighty language respecting any other provision for our spiritual advantage, the sacraments, and the Word of Inspiration alone excepted. Therefore, in the judgment of our Church, next to the habitual recollection of our baptismal Covenant, the devout participation of the holy eucharist, the affectionate study of the Sacred Volume, and that which necessarily pervades each, and all of them, constant and fervent prayer, we are called to the contemplation of the Christian cloud of witnesses, as, after those paramount means of grace, the holiest and happiest occupation in which we can be engaged; the surest method of obtaining the height of virtue, and the depth of peace here; and the most effectual preparative for that perfection of bliss, which awaits the triumphant Church in the regions of eternity.

We implore “grace to follow their good example; that, with them, we may be partakers of the heavenly kingdom;” that is, we entreat HIM, who has made this gracious provision for our improvement, that He would excite us to the contemplation of departed Christian excellence, and co-operate effectually with the contemplation thus excited. This, therefore, is *a means* of more than human efficacy: it is a model for shaping our character both of mind and

heart; and it is, through the softening power of the Divine SPIRIT, that we are to be made pliant to this exquisite model. *The end* is suitably exalted: it is, that being thus formed while here, we may be fitted for our destined place in the Church triumphant; that being, in this state of preparation, united in belief and practice, in mind and heart, to those who have gone before, who *being dead, yet speak*, we may hereafter participate in the same happiness; and mutually heighten our mutual bliss, by the everlasting remembrance of blessings interchangeably communicated and received.

Thus, in the doctrine of Vincentius, in the doctrine of the Church of England, we see the realisation of St. Paul's magnificent figure: we see the great mystical body gradually enlarged, and ultimately perfected, by a self-contained and self-advancing principle; each part in strictest harmony with every other part; and all the parts promoting the completion of the whole. *The whole body, fitly framed together, and compacted, by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working, in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body, unto the edifying of itself in love.* The mystical body, then, though at all times perfect in organization, is to gain its destined magnitude by slow degrees, and by continual accretion. And, consequently, the parts successively superadded must be made to accord with the antecedent parts; enlivened by one and the same animating spirit; operative by one and the same vital energy; aiding, not injuring, the general symmetry of the body; and, if we may so speak, circulating no strange blood through its veins and arteries. Otherwise, it is too manifest for discussion, the accession of parts would produce discordance of the whole.

It now remains to be asked, How could the representation of the Apostle be justly realised, except by that vital adherence of the later to the earlier members: or, rather, of the superadded parts to the original organization, for which VINCENTIUS, and THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, are equally solicitous? St. Paul illustrates this indispensable conformity by the figure of an advancing building, in

which the solidity and beauty must depend on the correspondence of each succeeding range with all the ranges which were previously erected; and, through this unbroken adaptation, the co-harmonized structure is, at length, to grow into an holy temple. An illustration which has never yet found so faithful a counterpart, as in that view of ecclesiastical consent, and Catholic interpretation, entertained, in common, by the Catholic Church in the fifth century, and by our reformed portion of that Divinely sustained and indissoluble body.

Let us, then, both cherish and improve this our invaluable distinction; and, for guidance, let us study the example of our best Reformer, the incomparable RIDLEY. Convinced, that to surrender CATHOLICITY, in the whole or in part, would be to sign the death-warrant of the English Reformation, no efforts of his opponents could dislodge him from the bulwarks of the ancient Church. Nothing could be more laborious, nothing more trying to every power of the mind, than to maintain defensive warfare on so vast and debateable a ground. Nothing, on the other hand, more easy, than to have intrenched himself at once within the fastnesses of Scripture. *Latimer*, his companion in suffering, but not his co-partner in wisdom, had strongly advised him to this latter course: that he rejected this counsel, and maintained his arduous post, can be ascribed only to the most immovable conviction, and the deepest sense of duty. This procedure is not to be lightly estimated. It is a precedent, weighty in its import, and impressive in its instruction, as ever was afforded by an individual below the rank of an Apostle. It cannot be too attentively examined, or too profoundly contemplated. It is an oracle of Providence, uttering a principle never to be forgotten, a rule never to be relinquished. And we entertain a cheerful confidence, that the doctrine hitherto preserved by a controlling Providence, will be more and more understood, appreciated, and supported, by all who revere the mild wisdom, and who delight in the accumulated piety, of our Primitive, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.—Pp. 379—387. Edit. 1824.

No. III.

A DEFENCE OF THE "HIGH CHURCH"¹ THEORY OF DOGMATICAL AUTHORITY," IN ANSWER TO THE OBJECTIONS OF ROMANISTS.

THE objections which are answered in the Preface occur in an Article, entitled "The High Church Theory of Dogmatical Authority," in the fifth number of the Dublin Review. It has been suggested to the writer of this note, by a Clergyman on whose opinion he places a high value, that the above Article requires some further notice in the pages of this Work. The following remarks upon it are from the pen of his learned and highly-gifted friend the Rev. W. J. IRONS, M. A. of Queen's College, Oxford, and Minister of St. Peter's Church, Walworth, Surrey, who has kindly allowed him to insert them here.²

The subject opens at p. 50 [of the Review], Concerning the rule of faith. Having recorded the High Church *admissions* chiefly as to the value of truly Apostolic Tradition, and its preceding Scripture, and attesting its Canon; the Reviewer writes thus: "Let us balance the admissions of this [Mr. Keble's Visitation] Sermon on the one

¹ This term is none of our making: Anglican Catholics is perhaps our best designation.—J. F. R.

² The letter in which they occur is addressed to the Editor of the British Magazine, and will appear in that excellent publication.—J. F. R.

hand, that originally Tradition, or a body of doctrines held in deposit by the Church, was the appointed and sufficient Standard of faith, with a Divine sanction—and on the other, that Scripture never claims all sufficiency [or declares the cessation of the previous commission to teach]¹; and we leave it to a candid reader to judge whether the acknowledged rights of the earlier method of preserving truth, can have been *superseded* by the introduction of the second.” To the “candid reader” I must also beg to appeal; and request him to peruse pp. 28—31 of the Sermon, and I think he will take them to be a sufficient answer to the Reviewer. He will there see that we do *not* argue that Tradition is “superseded” by Scripture; but only *regulated* by it. The very nature of the case would require (as the least reflection must convince any man) that when the Canon of the New Testament was once fixed, it must, at least, furnish some check on all subsequent Tradition. Will the Romanist go the length of affirming, that Almighty God could have declared any *part* of His will in a written Revelation, and yet that such declaration should produce *no effect* on the future Religious judgments of mankind? And yet, I think the Dublin Reviewer must go to this length, if he be consistent, to support the authority of the Church of Rome; and so deny that Scripture is *any* standard authority at all.

Surely a thoughtful Roman Catholic *must* own, that to *some* extent, Scripture is an authority and a

¹ The incorporating of *this* sentiment *thus expressed* (which I have inclosed in brackets), with that concerning the sufficiency of Scripture, is not right or fair, because the Anglican Church *does not hold this*.—W. J. I.

Standard ;¹ the only question between us is, or can be,—Whether it be an *all-sufficient* Standard? *We* think it, indeed, on *à priori* grounds, to be intrinsically probable that it *should* be so ; but whether it be thus or not, we are content to waive at present ; for, strictly speaking, it is a matter which may and must be decided by observation and inquiry. We appeal to the Catholic Church to decide between her Anglican and Roman members. It must be owned to be theoretically *possible*, that a certain sacred Volume might contain all sufficient Truth. We think that it *does*, as a matter of fact. Let the Romanist adduce at least some *One* truth, which the Church Catholic (“semper, ubique, et ab omnibus”) has received as indispensably necessary to salvation ; and which nevertheless is *not* contained in the Bible : then, and not till then, he will have proved his point : then, and not till then, shall I call the Anglican opinion an error ; then, and not till then, shall I cease to believe with St. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, that “Whatsoever is required to the salvation of man, is fully contained in the Scripture of GOD.”²

At p. 54, the Reviewer proceeds to consider more closely the English doctrine of the “*Via Media*.” Strangely enough, he seems even to question the *possibility* of “a middle state between

¹ Even the Old Testament, though it go not the whole extent of Christian Doctrine, was yet appealed to by our LORD and His Apostles as some sort of standard, *as far as it did go*. Obscure, for example, as were the Old Testament intimations of the doctrine of the Resurrection, yet in proof of it our LORD made His direct appeal to the Jewish Scriptures ; saying to the disputing Sadducees, “Ye do err, *not knowing the Scriptures*.” Surely no reasoner can deny, that if Scripture be true at all, then, *so far as it goes*, it must be a *Standard*.—W. J. I.

² Homilies, B. I. p. 3.

individual Judgment and infallible definitions. (See also p. 75.) I only know that I am, so far as I myself can determine, exactly in that very middle state which the Reviewer considers impossible. And I believe that most men, whatever their creed, are somewhat similarly circumstanced with myself; relying partly on their own judgment, and partly on something else. It may seem surprising to the Reviewer, but I really think that he himself is in a "middle state." He himself would not trust the "infallible" definitions of his own Church, did not his own "individual judgment" bid him. I think that the *not* being in a middle state is the impossible thing, after all, for a rational and social being. So that instead of the "*Via Media*" being a "mere theory," (as we are told again, p. 64,) it is the only really practical thing. The system of mere private judgment is indeed a "mere theory:" the system of Infallibility is not even that; for it seems impossible even to set it down on paper at all.

Now in attempting to show that the "*Via Media*" is a doctrine of a party *in* the English Church, and not of the Church itself, the Reviewer proposes to test the Church's opinion, by the "Universality of Consent" on the one hand, or "diversity of teaching" on the other, concerning any given point. And yet, at p. 58, when it appeared that the great body of the English Church thought the Prayer-Book to be necessary as a safe-guard or interpreter of the Bible, there we are reminded that the "smaller portion," who might think differently, is as much a part of the Church as the larger. It seems to me that a test is instituted, and almost exulted in for

its logical accuracy, at p. 54, and then ridiculed as practically absurd at p. 58. The Roman Controversialists are accustomed to show what the opinion of the Church is on any point, by quoting the testimonies of the leading Fathers of every age. The modern Anglican writers have adopted a similar method, and illustrate from their standard Divines the true Doctrine of their Church, as occupying a middle position between Roman and Latitudinarian extremes. And that they have been in some measure successful herein, the Reviewer can hardly help admitting. (P. 60.) But then he inquires, *Who* are the authorized divines—the “acknowledged authorities?” This is not wise, or Christian, because it is mere equivocation to pretend that this is a real and practical difficulty. Has any Infallible Council ever settled the question—Who are the “Fathers?” Yet we know that ignorant Protestants have often urged this question seriously against Romanists; but such a method surely was unworthy of the Reviewer.

P. 64. It is next urged as an objection to the Anglican doctrine, that, after all, it throws us back upon individual judgment. “Each one has to judge for himself, whether the Church¹ be contradicting the Doctrine of Scripture.” But I see not how any system can possibly steer clear of some such difficulty as this. I might just as well object against the doctrine of Infallibility, that, after all, “each man has to judge for himself whether the Church be infallible.” And I leave the Reviewer

¹ Any *particular* Church to which he may belong—it is acknowledged on all hands, that the Catholic Church will never agree in teaching and enforcing what is not true.—See *Brit. Critic*, No. XLIV. pp. 391, 392.—J. F. R.

to decide whether, in this case, the private judgment of the Romanist has not a rather more difficult task than of the Anglican. And it may not be deemed, perhaps, an inappropriate comment on the whole of the additional remarks on the "obscurity" of the English system, that the same objections, at least, lie against the undefinable system of Roman infallibility. And is there not much of religious impatience in these complaints of obscurity, or these attempts to deny its existence? Is it not murmuring against Him, who for the trial of our faith has ordained that we now see through a glass darkly?

P. 67. In order to show what the Reviewer calls the "practical inutility of our speculative system of authority," he puts a case:—Is a man who surrenders his own opinion to the judgment of the Anglican Church, more secure of the truth by so doing? And it is answered, that the "honest and explicit" reply could, on our principles, be no better than this—"Our Church indeed may err, but the 'immense advantage' of joining us will be, that you are joining a part of the Church Catholic; and that Church, taken together all over the world, will never agree in teaching and enforcing what is not true!" Now is this an impartial statement of the best that could be said by us? I will hope that the Reviewer thought so: and I submit, whether the following be not a better reply to such an inquiry as has been supposed:—"The advantage of surrendering individual judgment to that of the Church, lies in this, that it is a thousandfold more likely that an individual should err, than that a Church, which generally agrees with the holy Church throughout all the world, should in a given particular go fatally wrong!"

From this passage in the Review, the writer continues in a spirit very different from that in which he commenced his Article. At the outset there was what might be termed a controversial fairness and impartiality in his remarks; but from page 67 his readers are doomed to meet with taunts instead of reasons, banter instead of argument, and sneers at our Church's alleged misfortunes and imperfections, instead of the sorrow of a Christian sympathy. At p. 68 we are upbraided with our want of Communion with other Churches. Is this generous in point of feeling, or sound in respect of argument? Have we not been goaded and alarmed into our exclusiveness? And will the Romanist say that a temporary suspension of the communion of any one Church with the rest, severs that Church from all union with, and membership of, the Body Catholic? If he will not say this, his argument amounts to nothing; and if he will, then, at certain periods of the history of the early Church, the Churches of Antioch and Constantinople, and even of Rome, ceased to be parts of the Catholic body. But who, that bears in mind the anxious efforts made by our divines, at different times, to promote our communion with foreign Churches—who, that remembers that our Bishops are Catholically ordained, our Liturgies derived from Catholic Antiquity, and our efforts in spreading our Succession and our "COMMON Prayer" in the new world are crowned with so Divine a success—will, after all, venture to deny our union and communion in principle, and, as far as we can gain it, in practice also, with the whole Body of CHRIST? It is with unfeigned regret that I perceive, however, throughout the Reviewer's

remarks, the latent spirit of an ungenerous rivalry. Even when his statements are verbally impartial, he does not seem to try to enter into (if I might so say) the spirit of our Theory, even so far as to appreciate our relative position. I confess I long to see this controversy handled in a far different tone. Is it too much to ask of a serious-minded man, of any Creed, to consider with candour and generosity the opinions and circumstances of others, equally sincere with himself, we trust, and not less intelligent or less informed? I honestly believe that the English Church was literally driven into Protestantism. I should be sorry for the state of that man's mind, who can see in the Reformation nothing but an act of Ecclesiastical Rebellion. I put it to any Romanist of reflection to decide, whether there must not have been some weighty cause, some fearfully latent evils, which could have compelled a numerous company of men (beyond all honest doubt, many of them men of lofty minds and holy lives) to revolt against the existing regimen of the Church? The evils, indeed, which the Church in this country has suffered since the Reformation, we pretend not to deny—we publicly lament some of them in our Service-Book: and for many of them we are indebted to the tyranny of the State. During our connexion with the State, we have striven oftentimes for a purity as yet unattained. But are these ineffectual struggles of our Church fit subject for taunt and triumph? Is it not rather a spectacle to strike a thoughtful man with awe, to see a zealous and enlightened Church thus fruitlessly striving, from age to age, in an evil world—each generation, in turn, leaving on record its faithful witness of

Holy Discipline neglected and deplored? I will not recriminate; or there surely might be room. If, however, the Romanist will still dwell on our imperfections and consequent “insecurity”—as though he himself were faultless,—I must ask him to remember that there were once seven Churches in Asia—some of them not *very* pure; but let him decide whether *they* were branches of the Church Catholic—or were their members in an insecure state altogether, on account of their corporate imperfections?

Pp. 71, 72. The Reviewer next discusses another “inconsistency” in the Anglican System,—*viz.* in our doctrine respecting General Councils. The difficulty seems to be this: “If (as is allowed on all hands) the Catholic Church is indefectible, then its opinion, authoritatively declared, must be *infallible*; whereas the Anglicans say, that General Councils may err.” To this we reply, That in the *strictest* sense, no Council can be called so truly and properly General, as to be able to claim, *certainly*, all the prerogatives of the Church Catholic scattered throughout the world. The indefectibility is *in the Church herself*, and is only manifested in her Councils in proportion as the idea of Universality is realized in them. Hence this degree, or proportion, is to be tested by the universality of the *subsequent reception* of the decrees of any Council. It is not tested by numbers: at the Council of Chalcedon there were six hundred Fathers; at Constantinople only one hundred and fifty; yet they were (popularly speaking) both “General Councils,” because they both had the general imprimatur of the Church Catholic, *i. e.* they were universally

received, or nearly so. If it were possible that the Catholic Church could, in the highest and exactest sense, meet in a CATHOLIC COUNCIL, we should receive its sentence as infallible truth. In proportion, then, as a "General Council" realizes this idea, we hold its decisions in reverence. Is there any thing "inconsistent" in all this? On the contrary, is it not most reasonable?

Another difficulty urged in the same page of the Review is, "that because the same texts convey the promise of Indefectibility and Authority, then, whoever pretends to the Authority, must, in consistency, pretend to the Indefectibility also." To which I make brief answer, that this proves too much; because every individual Priest has *authority*; and yet he is not indefectible, or infallible. It is plain that many things may be predicated of the Church as a whole, which cannot be predicated of all its parts. That which is the characteristic of the whole, *as a whole*, cannot (by the very force of terms) be attributed to all the distinct parts thereof; except in some inferior degree.

P. 76. The Reviewer in the next place boldly affirms, that his Church claims "no more Authority" in matters of faith, than that of declaring and "defining what had been delivered" from the beginning. Concerning which I only say to the Reviewer, that he is grossly mistaken. Let him ask any parish priest of his Communion in all Ireland, and he will learn that *much* more authority than this is claimed by the Church of Rome.—P. 78. Another glance at this page induces me to lengthen these remarks by a sentence or two more. Why is all this exultation at the prospect of the contentions

of a Synod of the English Church? Would the Roman Church herself wish to court the scrutiny of another "General" Council? I think there are certain remembrances connected with the history of Trent which might make her members rather more humble! But why, I would ask, must our Controversy be still conducted in this spirit? I would to GOD that our Roman fellow-christians would solemnly enter on the debate in a grave and honest temper. Why will they not look boldly in the face of the question, for example, of the validity of our English Orders? Either we are Priests, or we are not. Why cannot this question be justly and honourably investigated and settled for ever? The present position of the Anglican Church is an enigma which the Romanists are bound to try to solve, one way or the other. Without this, no step towards unity can be taken. I earnestly protest, that (though my mind is fully satisfied on the point,) I am as desirous as any man that this matter should be thoroughly gone into, for the sake of that Universal Church which our SAVIOUR CHRIST hath purchased with His own blood.¹

¹ The above remarks may serve to refute the objections of Romanists to the principles of this work. Professor Keble, in the *Postscript* (just published) to his Visitation Sermon, triumphantly answers the exceptions of ultra-Protestants.

THE END.

NEW WORKS,

PUBLISHED BY

A. H. BAILY, & CO. 83, CORNHILL, LONDON.

In 8vo, boards, price 10s. 6d.

THE ELEMENTS OF PLANE AND SPHERICAL TRIGONOMETRY,

TOGETHER WITH

The Construction and Use of Logarithmic Tables.

Third Edition.

By J. C. SNOWBALL, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College,
Cambridge.

Also, by the same Author, in 8vo. boards, price 6s. 6d.

AN INTRODUCTION

TO

PLANE TRIGONOMETRY,

Designed for the Use of Schools in which Students are prepared for the
Universities.

In 18mo, price 3s. boards,

KEY to ORDINATION QUESTIONS, or

ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS

ON THE

OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT,

IN TWO PARTS.

Principally designed for Divinity Students.

By the Rev. SAMUEL TENISON MOSSE, A.B. Trin. Coll. Dublin,
and Curate of Brook Poringland, Norfolk.

In 18mo, gilt edges, price 2s. 6d.

THE

CHESS-BOARD COMPANION;

CONTAINING

The Laws of the Game, the best method of playing the Pawns and
Pieces; interspersed with numerous General Rules and Remarks:
written expressly for the use of Beginners. To which are added,

THE MOST APPROVED METHODS OF

BEGINNING AND ENDING GAMES;

ALSO

SEVERAL INSTRUCTIVE AND BRILLIANT PROBLEMS.

By W. LEWIS,

AUTHOR OF SEVERAL STANDARD WORKS ON CHESS.

New edition now ready, with the latest corrections, in 18mo, gilt edges,
price 4s.

MOSSE'S PARLIAMENTARY GUIDE;

A Concise History of the Members of both Houses of Parliament, their Connexions, Pursuits, &c. With a Synoptical Table of their Votes on the Leading Questions and Principal Divisions, from the Division on the Reform Bill to the present Period; Particulars of the late Elections; A Statement of the Gross Number polled on each Day at the several Contests in Ireland; Summary of the Number of Members returned in each County; An Abstract of the gradual Alteration in the Representation of the House of Commons, from the Reign of Edward the First; A graduated Scale of the Number of Voters in the United Kingdom; A List of the Boroughs enfranchised and disfranchised by the Reform Bill; The Members of the former and the late Parliament who have not been re-elected; The Names of those by whom the principal Ministerial Appointments have been filled for nearly the last Century; And an Analysis of the relative Strength of the two great Political Parties in the House of Commons.

By R. B. MOSSE, Esq. Parliamentary Agent.

"Numerous as have been the 'Parliamentary Guides,' 'Pocket Companions,' 'Directories,' 'Assistants,' and 'Instructors,' published since the passing of the Reform Bill, we can positively assure all those whom it may concern, that a work of the kind in all respect so comprehensible, so valuable, so complete, and so excellent as this, has not before been presented to the country. The changes effected in the representation of the country by the Reform and Boundary Bills, are defined with astonishing accuracy. After a mass of the most valuable information, the importance of which to the elective body cannot be overrated, the work contains the whole of the Standing Orders of the two Houses of Parliament. No elector should be without this invaluable little volume."—SUN, Aug. 7, 1835.

"There is in Mosse's 'Parliamentary Guide' a more extensive mass of well-digested practical information, than in any other compendium of the kind that has fallen under our notice. We should regard it as an indispensable book of reference to every one connected nearly or remotely with Parliamentary affairs."—COURT JOURNAL, Aug. 8, 1835.

"A very copious and useful Guide, comprehending all that was good in former productions of the same class, with more supplied by Mr. Mosse's own intelligence."—LITERARY GAZETTE.

*** Several New Editions of this Work are published in the course of each Session, with the latest corrections.

GUIDES FOR TRAVELLERS,

By F. COGHLAN.

London: A. H. Baily and Co. 83, Cornhill.

	s.	d.		s.	d.
St. Petersburg	8	0	To Boulogne	2	0
Up the Rhine (New Edition)	5	0	To the Coast of England	3	6
To Paris (Seventh Edition)	4	0	Ditto in Parts, each	1	0
To Belgium and Holland	6	0	French Interpreter	1	0
Through France	6	6	German Interpreter	1	0
To Italy	4	0	Custom House Guide	1	0
To Brussels	2	6	Panorama of the Rhine	8	0
To Calais	2	6	Maps, various, from	1	6

A. H. Baily and Co. have always on sale a large assortment of the most approved GUIDES, MAPS, INTERPRETERS, &c. &c. for all parts of the Continent.

75

7. 24.

Russell, John F.

The judgment of the anglican church (posterior to the reformation)

London 1838

Polem. 2414

urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10776208-0